

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 10, 1916.

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 30, 1916.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Overman	Stone
Bankhead	Hollis	Page	Sutherland
Borah	Husting	Pittman	Swanson
Brady	Johnson, Me.	Poinexter	Taggart
Brandeggee	Jones	Pomerene	Thomas
Bryan	Kenyon	Ransdell	Thompson
Burleigh	Kern	Reed	Underwood
Chamberlain	La Follette	Robinson	Vardaman
Chilton	Lane	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Clapp	Lodge	Shafroth	Walsh
Clark, Wyo.	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Warren
Colt	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Weeks
Culberson	Nelson	Shields	Williams
Cummins	Newlands	Simmons	Works
Dillingham	Norris	Smith, Ga.	
Gallinger	Oliver	Smith, S. C.	
Hardwick		Smoot	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], who is away on official business. He is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY].

I desire also to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], on account of illness.

I wish also to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE], who is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GORF].

These announcements may stand for the day.

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. GORF] is absent on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Wednesday, the 12th, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], I shall submit some remarks on preparedness and the pending military bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I understood that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] desired to address himself to that amendment. I do not see him present. Besides, I understood that we were going to take up the sugar bill this morning at 11 o'clock.

Mr. OVERMAN and others. At 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] answered to the roll call.

Mr. SMOOT. The sugar bill is to be taken up not later than 12, and we can begin now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. NORRIS. Let us have the amendment to the amendment read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state it.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 17, strike out the words "and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I had supposed that the sugar bill would not be taken up at 11 o'clock, but I am ready to proceed with it now, unless the Senator from Oregon wishes to go on with the military bill until 12 o'clock.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is immaterial to me. If the Senator prefers I am willing to go ahead with this bill until 12 o'clock.

Mr. JONES. I think it was the general understanding that the sugar bill would come up at 11. The unanimous-consent agreement says "not later than 12." I know Senators who are expecting to speak on the pending amendment are not here.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am ready to go on with the sugar bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Then I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside in order that we may take up the sugar bill, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and lays House bill 11471 before the Senate.

DUTY ON SUGAR.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11471) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Committee on Finance will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on Finance reports to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and in lieu thereof to insert:

That the third proviso of paragraph 177 of the act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913 (Stat. L., vol. 38, pp. 114 to 202, inclusive), be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1920, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty."

Sec. 2. That the proviso of paragraph 178 of the aforesaid act be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1920, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the difference between the bill as passed by the House and the Senate committee amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute, is very simple. The act of October 4, 1913, provided that after the 1st day of May, 1916, sugar should be admitted free. The bill as passed by the House repealed the free-sugar proviso of the act of 1913, thereby placing sugar upon the dutiable list without any limitation as to time. The Senate committee amendment retains the free-sugar provision of the act of 1913 and extends the time when it shall go into effect from May 1, 1916, to May 1, 1920. That is to say, the effect of the Senate committee amendment is simply to extend the time when sugar shall cease to be dutiable and become free—four years longer—the original act having extended the time for nearly three years.

When the original act was passed the time for the free proviso to go into effect, to which I have referred, was extended to meet a situation which existed at that time with respect to the industry in this country. The justification for the present proposed extension is to meet another and a new situation growing out of the needs of the Treasury and the general revenue situation of the Government.

The Senate committee in its amendment seeks to preserve the principle enunciated in the original act in favor of free sugar and to provide for the emergency, which it is believed will be of a temporary character, by again extending the time so as to bridge over the present revenue situation created by the effect of the war conditions in Europe.

Mr. President, when the act of 1913 was framed and when it was decided that sugar should be untaxed, but that to meet a situation it was necessary or expedient and just to extend that period for three years, the Congress, acting upon the report of the Finance Committee, decided that during the three years while sugar was to remain on the dutiable list, the duty should be reduced so as to conform to the theory upon which the bill was framed, to wit, as a revenue-producing measure based upon competitive rates. Carrying out the purpose of giving the people the benefit of the same ratio of reduction upon sugar during the three years it was to remain upon the dutiable list that was given with respect to the other articles retained upon the dutiable list in the bill, your committee proceeded to reduce the duties of the Payne-Aldrich bill upon sugar just as it proceeded to reduce them upon other articles.

The duties imposed by the Payne-Aldrich bill upon sugar were protective. We reduced those duties upon sugar about 25 per cent. That was about the same or probably a little greater reduction than those made upon other staple articles taxed by both the Payne-Aldrich bill and by the present law. In other words, Mr. President, we reduced the duties upon sugar during those three years just about in the same ratio that we reduced the Payne-Aldrich duties upon woollens and cotton goods and upon iron, steel, and many other articles. So, if this period is again extended for four years, sugar will be dutiable as other articles in the act are dutiable, not upon a protective basis, but upon a revenue basis, according to the revenue standard fixed in that bill; that is to say, Mr. President, if the duties which the present law imposes upon woollens and cotton goods, upon iron, steel, and other commodities are revenue rates or free-trade rates, as our Republican friends are in the habit of saying, then sugar, which was then subjected to the same degree of reduction, will also be continued upon a revenue basis.

Mr. President, the attitude of both political parties in this country in the past toward sugar has been one of alternately favoring free and dutiable sugar. The Mills bill, which was a Democratic measure, free listed sugar. The McKinley bill, which was a Republican measure, also free listed sugar. The Wilson bill, a Democratic measure, took sugar off the free list, where the McKinley bill had placed it, and placed a duty upon it of 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from North Carolina perhaps would like to be absolutely accurate in the statement he is making.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. I am not making this statement in a controversial spirit at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Nor do I intend to make my statement in that spirit.

Mr. SIMMONS. If I am inaccurate, I shall be very much obliged if the Senator from Utah will correct me.

Mr. SMOOT. What I wanted to suggest to the Senator from North Carolina was that the McKinley bill provided a bounty on sugar, instead of a tariff.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, yes; but it placed sugar upon the free list. The Wilson bill, as I said, Mr. President, a Democratic measure, took sugar from the free list where the McKinley bill had placed it and placed it upon the dutiable list. The Dingley bill, a Republican measure, retained sugar upon the dutiable list and increased the duty upon it. The present tariff law, following the Mills bill, placed sugar upon the free list, but postponed the time when the law should go into effect for about three years.

The discussions in Congress and outside of Congress on the several bills to which I have referred show that the change in attitude of the two parties with reference to the taxing or untaxing of sugar has been influenced largely—not altogether, but largely—by the financial condition of the Treasury and the need of the Government for revenue. Revenue considerations were probably as influential in bringing about the diverse treatment of this commodity by the Republican Party as by the Democratic Party.

Now, Mr. President, in order to show that apparently our Republican friends have felt as we did, that sugar, a necessary of life, consumed by all the people, the poor as well as the rich, ought to be untaxed when the revenue situation of the Government permitted, I wish to read some extracts from the speeches of leading Republican Senators, with reference to this subject, when the last four bills to which I have referred were under consideration in the Senate.

When the McKinley bill, placing sugar upon the free list, was before the Senate in 1890, Senator Aldrich, who was a conspicuous leader of the Republican Party and a recognized authority upon matters pertaining to the tariff and revenue, addressing himself to that bill, said:

Whatever duty we remove from raw sugars will be for the benefit, and the direct benefit, of the people of the United States.

Senator Hale, then prominent in Republican councils, and also a recognized authority, said:

The reciprocity amendment, adopted by the Republican Congress and signed by a Republican President, was based upon the determination of the Republican Party to put upon the tables of the American people untaxed sugar, and to reduce the surplus revenue of the country to the extent of \$60,000,000 a year.

Mr. Morrill, the author of the Morrill Tariff Act, speaking to the same general effect, said:

The question of adding free sugar to the breakfast table presents even a stronger case than tea and coffee presented in 1872 for like treatment. Every dollar of the duty imposed comes out of the poor as well as of the rich. If you can prudently—

Said Mr. Morrill—

do without the revenue of over \$50,000,000, clearly it should be done without hesitation. There is no article so largely and so equally consumed by the people.

That was when the Republican Party proposed to put sugar upon the free list, and as a result of the attitude of leading Senators representing the dominant party it was placed upon the free list.

Four years afterwards, when the Wilson bill, which took sugar from the free list, where the McKinley bill had placed it, and put it upon the dutiable list, on the amendment of Senator Jones, of Arkansas, imposing a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem upon it, was under consideration in the Senate, Senator Peffer, Populist Senator from Kansas, but who, affiliated with the Republican Party before, after, and while he was in Congress, offered an amendment to place sugar upon the free list, and it was supported by every Republican in the Senate. After the failure of that proposed amendment in Committee of the Whole to put sugar upon the free list, the great Senator from Rhode Island, Senator Aldrich, with, I think, some little evidence of

plique, said, addressing himself to the Democratic Senators who had voted against the amendment:

I say to you now, that when this question is reached in the Senate, we shall try on this side of the Chamber to secure, if possible, a vote for free sugar.

There was no proposition then to retain a bounty upon sugar. Senator Peffer knew when he introduced that amendment—

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator please give the year when that occurred?

Mr. SIMMONS. 1894.

Mr. CURTIS. That was at a time when we were producing very little, if any, beet sugar.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think we were producing some beet sugar at that time; but that is not pertinent to the line of argument which I am pursuing. I say that when Senator Peffer offered that amendment, which was supported by all the Republicans, to put sugar on the free list; when Senator Aldrich gave utterance to the sentiments that I have just read, to the effect that, notwithstanding the Peffer amendment had been defeated in Committee of the Whole, when it got into the Senate he and his party would try, if possible, to get another vote to put sugar on the free list—there was, I say, at that time no thought on the part of Senator Aldrich or any other Republican Senator that if sugar should be put on the free list in a Democratic measure the Democratic Party would put a bounty upon sugar. Everybody knew that the Democratic Party was then, as now, and always, irrevocably opposed to bounties. Hence when, in 1894, the proposition to retain sugar on the free list came from the Republican side of the Chamber, with the support of the leaders and the entire body of the Republican side, it meant free sugar without bounty; and while the attitude of the party in 1890, when the McKinley bill was adopted, with reference to putting sugar upon the free list might in part have been dictated by the supplemental policy of a bounty upon sugar to protect the American producer, whose product was about to be put upon the free list, in 1894, when the Democrats were taking it off of the free list and were met with opposition from the Republican Party and with the insistence on their part that it should remain upon the free list, it was unequivocally a vote to free list sugar without any reference to or expectation of a bounty to the sugar producers to supply the place of the duty they sought to remove.

Senator Hale, addressing himself to the Wilson bill, in which the Democrats put a duty on sugar, said:

Mr. President, there is one thing that is certain as the coming of the tides and sunrise, and that is that whatever happens to be put finally into the bill and is comprehended in its features when it passes, the American people will not go long without a return to the features of free sugar for the breakfast tables of the people, thereby saving to those breakfast tables an annual tax of between \$60,000,000 and \$70,000,000.

Senator Aldrich, in addressing himself to the bill in general terms—the other quotation that I have given from him had reference to the Peffer amendment—said:

I include also the representatives of the third party, those gentlemen who have always asserted that they were the friends of the people; they have signalized that friendship to-day by joining their Democratic allies in forcing upon the people of the United States—

What?—

this unjustifiable, indefensible, and infamous (sugar) tax. I said this tax was infamous—

Said the Senator—

and if I could employ any stronger word than that in characterizing it I should be glad to do so.

Senator Allison added his mite, and, of course, his mite was mighty, with this observation:

Mr. President, if I had my way, I should strike from this bill every vestige which provides a duty on sugar.

But the duty on sugar was retained, notwithstanding the stubborn opposition and aggressive fight made against it by the leaders of the Republican Party, backed by the whole body of that party in this Chamber.

In 1897, three years after that, when the Dingley bill was before the Senate, increasing the duty on sugar from 40 per cent ad valorem under the Wilson bill to 1.63 cents per pound, the report of Mr. Dingley declared and recognized that the purpose in retaining this duty and increasing it was in part in order to get more revenue. Senator Aldrich, still not satisfied that there should be a tax upon sugar, and evidently still adhering to his original views as expressed in 1890 on the McKinley bill and in 1894 on the Wilson bill, with that wisdom which characterized him in dealing with practical questions, yielded to the revenue necessities of that day, and waived at the time his opposition to a tax upon sugar. He said:

The pressing necessity for securing greatly increased revenue seems to render a return to the Republican policy of free sugar, adopted in 1890, an impossibility.

I suppose he meant the Republican policy upon this subject as exemplified and as enunciated in the McKinley bill.

The demand for revenue purposes, and a belief that every reasonable effort should be made to encourage the production of beet sugar in the United States, led a majority of the Finance Committee to recommend the high rates upon sugar which are contained in the bill now before the Senate.

Senator White, of Louisiana, who, although a Democrat, was in favor of a duty on sugar, as the Senators from that State have generally been. In his discussions of this bill, referring to the attitude of the Republican Party in 1890 and 1894, he makes clear the Republican thought and purpose at that time with reference to taxing sugar when a tax on it was not needed for revenue requirements, and that that purpose was correctly expressed and outlined in the speeches of leading Republicans which I have cited. Senator White said:

The American breakfast table was a source of solicitude on the other side of the Chamber during that debate—

Referring to the debate on the McKinley bill.

We were told that the poor man was entitled to have his sugar without any tariff mixture. Untaxed sugar was something that the Republican Party guaranteed to every American consumer. He must have sugar and he must have it free from tax. Yet, Mr. President, the same distinguished gentleman, I repeat, who at that time so roundly denounced the Democrats in this Chamber because of the imposition of a small sugar tariff, are here to-day levying a greater tax, as a result of their experience and in the face of their own advertised promises and record.

During the consideration of the Wilson bill, day by day it was dinned into the public ear of this country that the only true method of bringing about a correct solution of this entire tariff subject regarding sugar and the only way to build up the sugar industry was to impose a bounty. Throughout the consideration of that bill, from the day the debate began until it concluded, we were informed by the Senators from the other side of the Chamber that a tax on sugar was an outrage.

Mr. President, I have not recited these positions of the Republican Party for the purpose of making any political capital or for the purpose of entering into any partisan discussion. I have recalled them simply for the purpose of trying to show that, at the bottom, both parties believe, because of the fact that sugar is such a universal article of food, consumed equally by the rich and the poor, that it ought, if the Treasury conditions will permit, to be one of the untaxed articles, and that, so feeling, both of these parties have in the past placed sugar alternately upon one list and alternately upon the other list, and the revenue requirements of the Government have in large measure prompted and influenced the action taken in each case.

Mr. President, at this time I shall content myself with the statement I have made with reference to this measure, supplementing it only by the statement of what is known to every Senator—that the present financial situation, very much to our regret, on account of circumstances which we can in no way control, makes it necessary for us to have a large amount of additional revenue. Recognizing sugar as one of the best of all the revenue-producing articles, having reduced the rates to the revenue basis, according to the standards of our Democratic tariff act, we feel constrained to yield to the necessities of the hour, and further to extend the time for untaxing this food necessity.

I do not desire to say, and shall not at this time say, more with reference to this bill; nor do I desire, now or at any time during this debate, to engage in a partisan discussion of the tariff. I shall, however, if it becomes necessary as the debate proceeds, have more to say, although I trust we may avoid any prolonged or partisan discussion on account of the well-known anxiety of the Senate to expedite certain other legislation of great importance and emergency, and on account of the fact that it is important that this measure should be passed before May the 1st, when, otherwise, sugar will under the present law become free. Speedy action is also especially necessary in view of the fact that the sharp disagreement between the House and the Senate, if the Senate substitute passes, may require considerable time in conference, and the conference report may become the subject of considerable discussion in the one or the other body.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina permit a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have listened very carefully to the speech of the Senator; and while I think he might well have omitted some things that he has incorporated in his speech, yet I will ask the Senator this question: I assume that if this side of the Chamber can not have the House bill, which I think a large proportion of the Republicans prefer, the Senator will welcome our assistance in passing the amendment which he has reported from the Committee on Finance?

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course, Mr. President, we shall welcome the assistance of Senators on the other side. I have tried very

hard to say nothing with respect to this question, upon which I think there is accord to a large extent on both sides of the aisle, that might be presumably displeasing to the minority side of the Chamber.

Mr. NEWLANDS obtained the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply wish to say to the Senate that I did not intend to speak on this subject, and I thought we could get a vote on it very promptly; but the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina will compel me to make a statement. Therefore I shall desire to occupy a few minutes of the time of the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I trust that the contingency referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] will not occur, that the substitute providing for free sugar after 1920 offered by the Senate Finance Committee for the action of the House will be defeated, and I trust that the Democrats of the Senate will stand by the views of the President and the House as the best expression of Democratic sentiment upon this subject, rather than upon the views of the Democratic members of the Finance Committee.

I shall be brief, Mr. President, in my discussion of this question. I shall go no further back than the last Democratic convention, when a free-sugar plank urged before the committee on platform of the Democratic Party was defeated without, if my memory is correct, a dissenting vote.

I also refer to a unanimous report of the Democratic members of the Finance Committee of the Senate made only a short time before the meeting of the Democratic convention at Baltimore, in which those Democratic members unanimously reported in favor of a revenue duty upon sugar, declaring that it had been the traditional policy of the Democratic Party to levy such a duty.

We all know the history of the free-sugar proviso in the last tariff act. The President of the United States at that time urged, whilst the tariff was under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, that sugar should be put upon the free list, and I am reliably informed that at that time and before his expression of opinion there were only two members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House who favored free sugar. The Ways and Means Committee of the House yielded to the views of the President, and a provision insuring the reduced duty on sugar until 1916 and then putting it on the free list was put in the tariff.

The President also, when the bill came to the Senate, made a similar request of the Democratic members of the Finance Committee, and they yielded, the members of that committee being almost identical in membership with the Democratic membership of the Finance Committee at the preceding Congress, which declared that the traditional policy of the Democratic Party favored a revenue duty upon sugar.

A number of Senators from the West, including myself, who represented the arid and semiarid region, realizing that beet-sugar production was the basic agricultural product of that region, upon which in a large degree the agricultural prosperity of the region rested, endeavored to convince both the Senate Finance Committee and the President that fair dealing with reference to the beet-sugar industry required only a moderate reduction in the duty on sugar to a revenue basis and not ultimate free trade, but without result. There were enough members representing that region who, if they had acted independently of the caucus action, could have beaten the proviso establishing free trade in 1916; but being unwilling to defeat the will of the party as expressed in a party caucus, they finally reluctantly assented.

Mr. President, conditions have now changed. The European war is on. The country needs revenue, and we realize that as a result of diminished production of beet sugar in France, in Russia, and in Germany it was a fortunate thing that sugar production had been stimulated in this country by a duty upon sugar, whether that duty was of a revenue or of a protective character, for it had developed the production of nearly a million tons annually, pretty nearly one-sixteenth of the production of the world, within the boundaries of the United States, exclusive of our insular possessions, and unless that production had been stimulated the cutting off and the shortage of the production of Europe would have very largely added to the very largely increased price caused by the war.

Mr. President, I shall not go into the economics of this question now. I insist upon it that the Democratic Party declared that it would accomplish the revision of the tariff in such a way as not to injure or destroy any legitimate industry, and so I believe that as an industry beet-sugar production is en-

titled to fair and proportionate treatment with the other industries of the country.

I find in looking over the tariff act that the farm products of other regions, some 50 in number, in Schedule G, are dutiable, such as barley, macaroni, oats, butter, vegetables, eggs, poultry, hay, honey, citrus fruits, apples, and so forth. I presume the Democratic Party kept those products in the tariff act in redemption of the pledge made at Baltimore that they would have regard for every American industry in this revision and that meant a regard for agricultural as well as manufacturing industry, and that therefore they would not hurry these products to the free list, even though it might bring about a freer breakfast table.

I assume that the Democratic Party did that from a sense of justice and not simply from a desire of conciliating the agricultural interests in the humid region represented by the major part of the Democratic Party in Congress, and I insist upon it that justice and fair dealing require the same considerate treatment of the agricultural industries of the arid and semiarid region as it does of the agricultural industries of the humid region.

Mr. President, I regret very much to differ with the members of the Finance Committee of my own party upon this subject. I do not indulge in contention with them upon the subject. I regret that they, in view of the utterances of the Democratic members of the Finance Committee in the past, the traditional policy of the Democratic Party and the last expression of the party at Baltimore, did not fall in line with Democratic sentiment as expressed by the President and the House of Representatives in their recent action. So far as I am concerned, whilst I desire to stand with Democrats, I prefer to stand with the President and the House upon this subject rather than with the Democratic members of the Senate committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has on two or three occasions made the statement that the President is in favor of the House provision. By what authority does the Senator make that statement?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not do it by any direct authority. It was in the air at the time that the administration as a revenue matter proposed to do away with the proviso which put sugar upon the free list in 1916. Nothing was said about simply extending the period of the duty, and I assumed that the action of the House in absolutely, not qualifiedly, repealing the proviso was in harmony with the President's views.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply wanted the Senator to put in the RECORD if he knew from just what source his information came.

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; I have no direct expression, but it was in the air; it was generally believed at the time, and it was doubtless believed by the Democrats of the House, who almost unanimously voted for the repeal of the proviso without qualification.

Now, Mr. President, as to economic aspects of this question, I stand only for a revenue duty upon sugar.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not know upon what authority the Senator makes the statement with reference to the President's attitude. I am not myself advised upon it, but I do feel that it is safe to say that I am sure the President has no hostility to this provision of the Senate committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I will not add to my utterance upon that subject. All I can say is that it was apparently the view of the President, and certainly the expression of the Democrats of the House following his suggestion has been in favor of the repeal of this proviso without qualification.

As to the economic aspects of this question, Mr. President, we are about to enter upon an economic crisis at the close of the European war. No one can foretell the result of that war upon the economics of the world. The administration itself is apprehensive, and one of its reasons for recommending the organization of a tariff board is that the consideration of tariffs and action upon tariffs might be of the highest importance in the economic defense of this country, doubtless realizing that an invasion of cheap goods as the result of low wages and hard times abroad might be paralyzing to the industries of the country. So it has been engaged in the study of that question and also in the study of the question as to the anti-

dumping provision, all these studies stimulated by the apprehension that an invasion of goods from abroad at the end of this war may be as destructive to the wage earners of our country as an invasion of men.

It is wise to take proper caution, and inasmuch as the caution of the hour demands that we should repeal this proviso, why should we qualify it? Why should we refuse to leave future action upon sugar as upon other subjects, to the wisdom of the hour, guided by experience and information and knowledge, instead of putting this industry in a strait-jacket as a result of apprehension created by present action upon future conditions?

The debate during the discussion of the present tariff developed the fact that Cuba could deliver in New York and in New Orleans raw sugar for 2 cents a pound. As against that we know that the lowest price which can be accepted by farmers in the arid and semiarid regions for their beets is \$5 a ton, and that they insist upon a higher price and claim that they are being dealt with unfairly by the sugar-beet factories in giving them a lower price.

The average amount of sugar found in a ton of beets is from 200 to 300 pounds, the average, possibly, being about 250 pounds. So if we divide \$5 by 250, we have 2 cents a pound as the price paid by the manufacturer for the sugar in the beets themselves, delivered to the factory. So there we have these basic facts—raw sugar delivered in New Orleans and New York by Cuba, before the war, for 2 cents a pound; sugar in the beet—not raw sugar, not sugar in a manufactured state—delivered to the factory at the rate of 2 cents a pound. We all know that the price of refining raw cane sugar is about one-half the price of putting beets through the factory. We all know that the price of freight from New York and New Orleans to Mississippi and Missouri points is about one-half of the price of freight from the arid and semiarid regions to those points. How, then, will it be possible, if the duty on sugar is abandoned, for the beet-sugar raisers of the arid and semiarid region to compete with Cuba, which is capable of raising its production to an amount almost sufficient to supply the world with sugar, which is capable of delivering cane sugar in a raw state at New York and New Orleans for 2 cents a pound?

Then, do you wish to submit the entire sugar industry to the changes of conditions in Cuba itself—a revolutionary country, where at any time war, the result of domestic and civil conditions, can paralyze that industry, as it did prior to the Spanish-American War, reducing the entire production of that island, I believe, to about 400,000 tons, whereas to-day its production is nearly 2,000,000 tons.

Is it wise, if we are to enter upon a condition of economic as well as of military preparedness, to submit one of the most important food products of this country to the chance of revolution in Cuba, when, by a moderate revenue duty, beneficial to the Treasury of the United States, we can maintain, at least, and perhaps stimulate, a domestic industry that will result in the production of sugar and the maintenance in the end of a lower price level for sugar throughout the world?

Mr. President, I shall not dwell upon this subject further at this time. I will, in closing, merely express the hope that just at the time when we are entering upon an era of preparedness—military, industrial, and economic—we shall act with that deliberation and caution which should characterize our action upon so important a question, uncontrolled by all these considerations of consistency, lest, in endeavoring to square the action of to-day with the action of two years ago, when the action of two years ago was directly contradictory to the action by the Democratic members of the Senate Finance Committee of six months before and to the traditional policy of the Democratic Party, we should produce a condition of depression in the advancement of this great agricultural industry.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, two years ago the Democratic Party, then for the first time in many years in control of both Houses of Congress and of the national administration, proceeded to legislate in accordance with certain pledges which it had made to the people of the United States, and which involved, as the subject of first consideration, a thorough revision of the tariff laws. That majority approached the subject with a full appreciation of its importance and of the necessity of systematic procedure thoroughly representative of a majority of Democratic sentiment. The result was the enactment of what is popularly known as the Underwood-Simmons tariff law.

Schedule E of that statute reduced the duties upon sugar and provided that upon the 1st day of May, 1916, those duties should cease, when sugar would automatically go upon the free list. That decision was not reached without much controversy, some of which was acrimonious, but it was reached neverthe-

less; and, when reached, represented the Democratic attitude upon the subject and the Democratic construction of the Baltimore platform as well.

With those of my party who may challenge this statement I have no quarrel. There is no question that those who contend that the platform did not commit the party to free sugar and those who contend that the platform did commit the party to free sugar both find in that platform a substantive plank as a basis of their respective contentions, but the fact is that the party crystallized its own official construction of its duty as there outlined in the provisions of the Underwood law.

I had hoped, Mr. President, that, whether right or wrong in this conclusion, the vexed subject had been finally laid at rest and that our method of securing revenue would be hereafter largely confined to taxes upon wealth, as contradistinguished from taxes upon consumption. This conclusion was never accepted by those interested in the commodity, or by a great number of them, and it has been, therefore, the subject of more or less agitation ever since, always accompanied by the contention that the perpetuation of the tax was essential to the existence of the industry, although, when the amount of the duty was finally determined, it was declared with equal emphasis by its opponents that it was an inadequate protection.

We are now, Mr. President, confronted with a bill, the purpose of which is to strike out the provisos of schedule E and go back to the old régime, whereby an article of prime and universal necessity is to be indefinitely burdened with a tax, only a portion of which, as levied under its provisions, ever finds its way into the Treasury of the United States.

The Senate committee having charge of the bill, after due consideration, by its majority members have reported a compromise which is quite as distasteful to me as it is to my genial friend from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], but for an entirely different reason. My objection to it is that the law as it stands should not be disturbed; his that it is not made a permanent feature of our tariff law, as the House bill provides. These differences, however, Mr. President, are always bound to arise with regard to the vexed question of protection, and particularly between Democrats who believe in protection and those who do not; and that, I think, is the fundamental difference between the Senator from Nevada and myself, who, if I am to judge from his many public utterances, worships at the shrine of protection with an ardor equal to that of my distinguished friend from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I hardly think the Senator fairly represents my view regarding the tariff. I am not a free trader; I believe in a moderate tariff for revenue, so adjusted as not by sudden and precipitate reductions to prostrate industry and produce unemployment and want. I believe in the reduction of the excesses of a Republican high protective tariff; I believe that in proceeding from high protection to a moderate revenue basis we should proceed gradually, as our platform calls for; that the country, having placed itself upon the cliff of high protection, can not safely throw itself over the cliff to the levels below; and that the wise thing is to climb down slowly and laboriously without wrecking the country's industries. With this view I have sustained reasonable, moderate reductions in the tariff and am prepared to consider favorably others, bearing in mind the Democratic platform of Denver, which declared for a gradual reduction of tariffs toward a revenue basis, and bearing in mind also the similar plank in the Democratic platform of Baltimore, which declared that these reductions should be effected without imperiling or destroying any American industry.

Now, if the Senator can make a high protectionist out of the doctrine which I have thus enunciated, I am sure that I can not complain of the manner in which he seeks to do it, for he has been entirely good-natured about it; I can only complain of his logic.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would not for the world intentionally misrepresent the view or the position of my very dear friend upon any subject, least of all upon the tariff. I am willing to accept his explanation for what it may be worth. If I erred in classifying him with that school of protectionists of which the Senator from Utah is one of the chief apostles, I will retract it and place him in that school of protection of which the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] is so distinguished an advocate and representative; and I do so because I can not distinguish between the attitude of the Senator from Nevada, as just outlined, and that of the late, sometime promi-

nent, but now lamented Progressive Party upon the subject. I know that the Senator believes in stepping down from the "high pinnacle on to the distant plain," but I am satisfied that he would protest against the stepping-down process long before we reached the plain, and would insist upon suspending us somewhere between the top of the cliff and the plain below.

I am no free trader, Mr. President. Free trade might be classified in the language of the lamented Ingalls as "an iridescent dream." I am in favor of a tariff for revenue, because it is impossible to get rid of a tariff entirely; but, except as the protection is incidental to revenue duties, I am no protectionist. We belong, therefore, Mr. President, to different schools; and it is evident now, as it always has been, that, whatever the official views of the great political parties on the subject of protection may be, there is a divergence of sentiment among the members, at least of the Democratic Party, upon the subject, which never has been and, I presume, never will be reconciled.

Mr. President, the real object of this bill, however one may judge from expressions regarding it, is to prolong the duty on sugar. Its ostensible object is to provide revenue in order to meet the necessities of the Government. My contention that it is but an ostensible object is due to the fact that if it be necessary to raise a revenue upon sugar at all, or any other necessity of life, that necessity should find expression in legislation which would place in the Treasury of the United States every dollar of the tax so levied, instead of diverting a part only into the Treasury, and the other part into the pockets of the interests identified with the subject of the tax. In other words, if revenue is the prime motive behind this bill, and it is necessary to obtain it by taxing sugar, then we should tax it in such wise as to realize more than twice the amount of revenue for the Government. This can be effected by an excise tax of similar amount to the duty which is to be prolonged by the Senate substitute, and every cent of it would go into the Treasury of the United States. Moreover, Mr. President, the tax so raised would be a fixed quantity, and would not diminish in amount as the domestic product increased in amount.

It is estimated, speaking roundly, that the present duty upon sugar gives the Government an annual revenue of \$43,000,000; but an excise tax at a similar rate on all sugar—that produced at home and that imported—would give the Government, in round numbers, \$86,000,000 of revenue annually. Upon the assumption, therefore, that our present duty requires us to obtain revenue, and that the exigency justifies us in raising it from an article like sugar, then common sense, to say nothing of wise statesmanship, would readily suggest an excise tax as a substitute for the existing tariff duty of substantially 1 cent per pound.

But, Mr. President, that view does not seem to be a popular one. It found but little favor in our committee, which seemed to be reluctant to place an internal-revenue duty upon a necessity of life, lest the resentment consequent upon it should make the tax unpopular, although conceding what is self-evident, that the alternative of the excise tax could not affect the price of sugar any more than it is affected by the protective duty. I felt, Mr. President, and I still feel, that if the financial affairs of the Government are so desperate that taxes upon consumption should be prolonged, even temporarily, the dominant body should meet the situation by raising the revenue in the best way—by so raising it that the Government will receive all the returns, albeit, Mr. President, the subject of the tax should be a necessity of life.

Let me ask why we should for the sake of revenue give this favored industry further protection at such tremendous cost to the consumer? Certainly no one to-day will question the universal prosperity of the industry, with perhaps here and there an exception. Certainly not the most ardent protectionist will contend that it needs protection at this time. The contention must be, in the very nature of things, that hereafter, when present conditions shall have changed, the industry will need the further protection of the Government if it is to continue.

But we have, as I say, agreed upon a substitute, and if I vote at all I shall vote, with much reluctance, for it. It means that the proviso in Schedule E, instead of becoming operative on the 1st of May next, will become operative on the 1st of May, 1920. In other words, a postponement of the day of free sugar for four years is provided for in the substitute. This, according to present estimates, will yield \$172,000,000 for that quadrennial period; but it also gives the manufacturers and producers of sugar \$172,000,000. By this substitute, and upon the theory that we are obliged to have the revenue, we propose to donate to a great, prosperous, and wealthy industry an equal amount of money by authorizing its collection from the consumer. This may be all right; but I can not reconcile it with

my notions of Democratic duty, or with my views of practical, useful legislation. If it be right, then every view which I have expressed upon this subject since the Underwood bill came to the Senate for consideration is wrong. That may not be a remarkable thing. All of them may be entirely erroneous. Nevertheless, I believed them then, as I believe them now, to rest upon a firm basis, and to correctly outline the Democratic position upon the historic question of a duty for revenue.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I think the Senator made the statement that the sugar consumed in this country was divided about equally between that produced in continental America and the islands, on the one hand, and that imported from other sections.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Does the Senator know how much of the half imported is imported from Cuba?

Mr. THOMAS. Why, practically all of it, Mr. President. I think perhaps fifteen or twenty thousand tons come from other sources.

Mr. SIMMONS. All of it except about 2,000,000 pounds, I think.

Mr. THOMAS. From Cuba?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; all except 2,000,000 pounds.

Mr. THOMAS. I accept the correction.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator corrects his figures, then, as to the amount of bounty that would be given to the untaxed sugar. Practically all sugar is imported in raw condition by the Sugar Trust. The Cuban sugar pays 80 per cent of the rate named in the pending bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Much more than that; the Cuban duty is a trifle over a dollar a hundred pounds—a trifle over a cent a pound.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Would not the importers of sugar add the entire tariff, and would not they get 20 per cent of \$172,000,000 in addition to the \$172,000,000?

Mr. THOMAS. That I think is true, Mr. President. Of course, my estimates were based upon the fact that the bulk of the sugar imported into the country to make up the deficiency and supply the needs of the people comes from Cuba. But I think the question asked by the Senator from Arkansas must be answered affirmatively. To this sum of \$172,000,000 should be added the amount to which his question refers.

Mr. President, in the consideration of this measure two years ago, and the ultimate disposition that was made of it, the Senators from Louisiana were out of accord with their party action. Their position was perfectly consistent and entirely honorable. It was based upon a situation peculiar to that State as they understood it. I want to say here by way of digression, with regard to the sugar of Louisiana, that the real menace to it is not in the abrogation of all duties but in the expansion of the beet-sugar industry. The industry in the State of Louisiana has been the subject of the fostering care of the United States for a century. Climatic conditions, problems of labor, and other considerations have demonstrated that this protection, extended for so many years, has not been sufficient to place the industry upon a self-sustaining basis, and never will. On the other hand, during the last quarter of a century a new sugar industry, protected for the greater part of its existence, but a new industry nevertheless, has asserted itself, and to-day produces nearly one-fourth of the total consumption of sugar in this country. It has expanded and will continue to expand in the Far West, tariff or no tariff, until by the processes of natural growth and natural selection the less favored industry in the State of Louisiana must ultimately disappear. I believe the time will come when the action of the Sixty-third Congress upon this subject, much as it may have directly affected the material welfare of the State of Louisiana, for whose people I have every consideration, will be regarded as the wisest step that could have been taken regarding it, since during the interval between the enactment of the law and the time when it was designed to take effect due provision could be made for doing away with the industry in that State and taking up other and more profitable pursuits.

I venture the assertion that if a tariff of 100 per cent ad valorem were placed upon sugar in 25 years from now the domestic product would be confined to our insular possessions and to the great semiarid and arid regions of California and the Rocky Mountain West, enjoying, as they do, physical advantages which adverse legislation can not affect and which do not need the protecting influence of legislation to make them operative.

Mr. President, the production of sugar never was so profitable to manufacturers as it is now and as it has been since August, 1914. I venture to say that no industry upon this continent can show more prodigious returns than those derived by the sugar companies of Porto Rico and Hawaii and the beet-sugar companies in the United States, with here and there an exception due either to poor management or undesirable location. The price of sugar at present is phenomenal, and there is no question in my mind that it is going to be higher for a long time before it falls.

In this connection I want to call attention to a few comments that I have clipped recently from some of the newspapers upon this subject. I first refer to the Chicago Journal of the 21st day of March last. This paper says:

There is a possibility of Chicago housewives being compelled to pay 10 cents a pound for sugar within a very short time.

The United States exported more sugar in the year ended March 15 than in any year in the history of the country. The export of refined sugar on that date totaled 173,684 tons, as compared with a total of 25,873 tons for the year ended March 15, 1915.

Let me digress here, Mr. President, with the statement that we have become exporters of the refined product within the last 24 months. Prior to the outbreak of the war the export of sugar from the United States was negligible. To-day, owing to changed conditions—and of course that adds to the price of the domestic product—we have become great exporters of sugar to other nations, and the trade which has been thus acquired will survive the war for many years if there be any truth in the reports of the provisions that are being made by the allies for trade conditions after the war as affecting their future relations with their present enemies, the central empires.

The result of this unprecedented export trade is that sugar is now \$7.20 per 100 pounds wholesale. One year ago it was \$6.35 per hundred. On January 1 of this year sugar could be purchased in Chicago for \$6.20 per hundred, wholesale. The retail price now is from 7½ cents to 7¾ cents.

The biggest buyers of American sugar are England and France. Norway and Sweden, which formerly purchased their supply in Germany, have been compelled to turn to the United States. Added to these buyers are Italy, shut off from Austria, and Greece, formerly a buyer on the German and Austrian markets.

"If Europe was to talk peace to-morrow, the price of sugar would fall off \$1 per hundred," said N. N. Jacobson, of Reid, Murdoch & Co., wholesale grocers. "But unless they begin the peace talk within the next few months there is a possibility of the retail price going to 10 cents a pound. At best, an estimate of the probabilities of sugar going much higher is a gamble. Merchants do not count on making much profit on sugar, and when the price advances they generally shut down on their orders, and consumers do not use as much."

W. T. Chandler, vice president of the Franklin MacVeagh Co., wholesale grocers, said that he believed the advance in price was temporarily checked.

"I do not know whether the rumors of peace talk have anything to do with this or not," he said. "Of course peace would mean that they would resume the production of sugar in Europe, which would mean a falling off in our export trade. This obviously would mean cheaper sugar at home."

"The price charged by the merchant is regulated by the wholesale price and advances very slowly. Profit is not looked for, and there will consequently not be any big increase—a jump of from 7 to 10 cents a pound, I mean. I would not care to speculate on what sugar will do. But I admit that 10-cent sugar is a possibility."

From the Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo., of March 18, I clip the following:

SUGAR GOING UP—NO HOPE OF ITS EVER COMING DOWN.

The price of sugar is advancing steadily, with no prospect for any immediate or remote reduction. The passing of the bill keeping the tariff duty on sugar, together with an unprecedented demand for the product, means the development of manufacturing facilities, restricted only by funds to finance projects, the ability to secure materials and suitable locations, according to W. L. Petrik, of the Great Western Sugar Co. The building of eight factories, two in Nebraska, two in Wyoming, and four in Utah, will begin at once, actual construction being deferred until action upon the sugar bill, which passed the National House Thursday by a vote of 364 to 14.

How familiar that sounds, Mr. President! It is the usual "hold up," warning. Action upon these new structures will be deferred until final action is taken by the Congress of the United States upon the subject of free sugar. I know of two or three new enterprises in my own State and an adjoining State which will not be halted, in my judgment, by anything of the sort, although in a sense they are not new enterprises. In the main they simply consist in the transplantation or transfer of old sugar plants, located in unsatisfactory places, to newer and more attractive locations.

I also refer to and ask leave to insert in the Record without reading it a similar quotation from a New York paper of the 16th of March.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SUGAR SITUATION ACUTE.

NEW YORK, March 16.

The situation in the sugar market is rapidly growing acute. Both spot and refined sustained further advances to-day, the latter rising 15 points, to 6.90 cents. Price of raws was marked up 13 points, to

5.77 cents. It is pointed out that since Secretary McAdoo made his speech in favor of the repeal of the duty on sugar the price of that article has risen 2 cents a pound.

In well-informed sugar circles the belief is growing that the only way this rise in the price of sugar and sugar products can be arrested is by the rescinding of this duty. It is pointed out that Cuban interests practically control the sugar market of the world, and they can mark up prices at their will. Insular prices, in consequence, are raised hand in hand with the Cuban interests. Shortage in the crops of Germany and Austria has in no way served as a check to the Cuban market, which is controlled by United Fruit, Canadian Pacific, Cuban-American, and Cuban Cane Sugar Corporation interests.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. President, let me briefly refer to some of the phenomenal conditions, some of the remarkable profits, some of the tremendous incomes that beet-sugar companies have enjoyed in consequence of this rise in prices. I read a quotation from a trade journal published in New York:

Profits: The Great Western Sugar Co. was organized in 1905 with a capital of \$30,000,000, of which there is outstanding \$13,630,000 preferred and \$10,544,000 common. The common stock was "all water," according to the testimony of its president, Mr. Morey.

I may add that fully 30 per cent of the preferred stock was watered also.

The attached forecast of the Great Western Sugar Co.'s position indicates the prosperity of this "infant" industry. On January 1 it had \$10,000,000 in cash and \$10,000,000 in sugar, making a total surplus of \$20,000,000. The Central Aguirre, of Porto Rico, is now paying dividends at the rate of 24 per cent per annum, but it is suggested to go on a 10 per cent basis next quarter, making dividends at the rate of 40 per cent per annum.

Many of these "infants" are expected to disclose their real profits after the tariff bill, insuring an added profit of \$22.40 per ton for the next four years or indefinitely, has safely passed the Senate and the House. In anticipation sugar stocks have shown a further advance.

I do not care to read the table, but will insert it in the Record with the permission of the Senate.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Name of company.	Price Mar. 1, 1914.	Price Febru- ary, 1916.	Price Mar. 31, 1916.
South Porto Rico Sugar Co. (preferred).....	\$59.00	\$110.00	\$117.00
South Porto Rico Sugar Co. (common).....	30.00	170.00	197.00
Central Aguirre Sugar Co. (preferred).....	35.00	165.00	177.00
Central Aguirre Sugar Co. (common).....	15.00	167.00	181.00
Fajardo Sugar Co. (preferred).....	14.00	86.00	100.00
American Beet Sugar Co. (preferred).....	65.00	95.00	95.00
American Beet Sugar Co. (common).....	20.00	68.00	74.00
Great Western Sugar Co. (preferred).....	91.00	112.00	114.00
Great Western Sugar Co. (common).....	45.00	140.00	206.00
Michigan Sugar Co. (preferred).....	85.00	100.00	100.00
Michigan Sugar Co. (common).....	35.00	102.00	112.00
Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. (par. 10, preferred).....	6.50	12.50	12.50

The rescission of the duty would partially reduce the price to the consumers. Nothing else will do it. But I think the removal of the duty would unquestionably result in lowering the price, because the expectation of free sugar prior to the outbreak of the war sensibly affected the price. It was one of the few necessities of life the price of which was actually reduced—I will not say by the law, but I believe that to be the fact—between the enactment of the law and the month of August, 1914.

We have heard much about the high cost of living. It is a question more acute to-day than it ever has been. Here is one instance, on example, one opportunity for lowering to some extent the price to consumers of a prime necessity of life by allowing this law to go into effect in accordance with its original purpose and intent.

Mr. President, I have prepared a somewhat rough table giving an estimate of the profits of beet sugar during the last two years, based upon the Colorado beet-sugar crop for 1915 of Willett & Gray, who are the recognized authority upon the subject.

The beet-sugar crop of the State of Colorado for the year 1915 was 244,409 tons—about one-third of the entire crop. This is the equivalent of 547,677,760 pounds. At 6 cents a pound, less \$2.70 cost of production per hundred—and that is the cost testified to or stated before the Hardwick committee in 1912 of producing sugar at that time—that would leave a profit of \$3.30 per hundred. With sugar at 6 cents and a total profit for the crop of \$18,063,366, upon an estimated product of 200,000 tons at 5 cents per pound for the crop of 1914, would produce \$12,544,000, or a total in the two seasons of \$30,617,366, a profit which is probably less than that actually realized; and of course it does not take into consideration the by-products of the industry, which in 1914 were worth about 47½ cents per ton.

Of the above production the Great Western Co. should be credited with about two-thirds; that is to say, it produces about two-thirds of the entire beet-sugar crop of the State.

This gives it \$20,412,578 for the two years. The other companies—the American Beet Sugar Co. being the principal one—would represent the beneficiaries of the remaining third.

On the 5th day of April the Wall Street Journal said that the American Beet Sugar Co. had announced earnings for the year ending March 31 at \$3,000,000. I am satisfied that this represents but a small portion of its actual profit. Senators may perhaps remember that during the hearings before the committee appointed to inquire into the President's charge concerning a lobby, it was admitted by Mr. Oxnard, the founder of this company, that the actual money invested in his concern was \$4,000,000, when it was capitalized at \$5,000,000 preferred, with \$15,000,000 of common. The admission of this company as to its earnings for 1915 means that for a single year its net profits have been three-fourths of the amount of money originally invested and three-fifths of the amount of money actually invested by it in the business up to the time of that lobby hearing.

Mr. President, in this connection I wish to call attention to the statement of the New York News Bureau of March 30, 1916, regarding the Great Western. This is from Boston:

It is understood that the Great Western Sugar Co. has been ripening a melon that is almost ready for plucking. This company, one of the largest beet-sugar producers in the world, has prospered enormously since the war lifted raw sugar prices to the highest level of years. The common stock, of which there is \$10,544,000 outstanding, has advanced from 50 last September to the present market of 200. There is likewise \$13,630,000 7 per cent preferred outstanding, the authorized amount of each issue being \$15,000,000. The American Sugar Refining Co. is a substantial minority stockholder.

I will come to the share feature of the sugar situation a little later on. I ask leave to insert without reading the remainder of this quotation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Great Western Sugar has paid common dividends of 5 per cent since January, 1910. The company issues no financial statements, but it is said on authority that the 1915 earnings were safely over 50 per cent on the common stock. For the current year, if sugar prices hold, the company may easily earn \$70 a share. Therefore, so far as earnings alone count, the company could easily multiply its present dividend, but because of the uncertainty regarding possible tariff reduction directors have so far stifled the temptation. Great Western had approximately \$10,000,000 cash on hand at the beginning of the present year and about the same amount in sugar. It is likely that current liabilities were small, so that the excess current assets were probably equal to \$200 per share on the common stock, setting off plants against the preferred-stock issue.

Great Western Sugar is in a position to pay a handsome extra dividend in cash, or to capitalize part of its bulky surplus by the declaration of a stock dividend. The belief is prevalent that some such action is a near-by probability.

Mr. THOMAS. At or about this same time the American Beet Sugar Co. announced a 6 per cent dividend on its common stock. This followed the passage of the House bill repealing the provision regarding free sugar.

Mr. President, there are other companies, as well, engaged in the production of cane sugar, whose condition is equally prosperous and whose returns in proportion to the amount of their capital stock are equally great.

I ask leave to insert, without reading, articles from the San Francisco News Bureau of Monday, March 6, 1916, March 10, 1916, and an article from the San Francisco Chronicle of March 15, 1916, and relating to the financial affairs of certain Hawaiian companies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HAWAIIAN SUGAR STOCKS.

[San Francisco News Bureau, Monday, Mar. 6, 1916.]

Honolulu: While stocks continue to climb, investors, speculators, and all persons interested in Hawaiian sugar stock or its profits, which means practically all the business men in the Territory, are wondering how large a part of the millions now held in reserve will be paid out in special dividends. That extra dividends will be declared by most of the companies is generally conceded on all hands, though no intimation of any official nature has been given out that any such plan is in the wind. Dividends of from 20 to 30 per cent, and even higher in some instances, were paid by the sugar companies during 1915, but without exception those on a paying basis piled up huge reserves because of the then uncertain prospect of the sugar tariff. Free sugar is not even a remote danger, and there is no prospect of an early termination of the European war to reduce prices. With land and mills in the best condition ever known in the history of the industry on these islands, and with bulging treasuries, it is held certain that big dividends will be paid as soon as the bill repealing the free-sugar clause has safely passed Congress and been signed by the President. Sixteen companies had on hand cash balances totaling \$8,751,000 at the end of 1915, according to the best obtainable information.

HONOKAA SUGAR EARNINGS.

[San Francisco News Bureau, Mar. 10, 1916.]

Honolulu: Honokaa Sugar Co. and the Pacific Sugar Mill, by the purchase of 175,000 shares of stock in the Hawaiian Irrigation Co. (Ltd.), the price totaling more than \$95,000, now own practically all the shares

in the latter corporation, according to reports presented to Honokaa and Pacific Sugar shareholders at their annual meeting. The annual report of F. A. Schaefer, president of Honokaa, follows, in part: "The cost of producing a ton of sugar was considerably reduced, viz, from \$65.130 to \$54.242, these figures not including bond interest, etc., while the net profit on the crop over and above all charges was \$161,849, which includes a charge of \$17,720 sinking fund on the bonds, which is payable to the trustees during this year. During the year the directors, on the authorization of the stockholders, purchased a four-sevenths interest in 122,500 shares of the Hawaiian Irrigation Co. (Ltd.) for the sum of \$81,479, paying for the same in cash. This purchase gives to this company and its neighbor, Pacific Sugar Mill, practically all of the shares of the Hawaiian Irrigation Co. (Ltd.), and is expected to prove very advantageous."

The annual report of F. A. Schaefer, president Honokaa Sugar Plantation, also refers to the fact that the cost of production was reduced approximately \$11 per ton.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 15, 1916.]
SIXTEEN HAWAIIAN COMPANIES HAD \$8,751,000 CASH ON HAND.
(By Charles Remington.)

Sixteen Hawaiian sugar plantations, according to actual figures in some instances and estimates in others, closed the year with \$8,751,000 cash on hand. This fund has been built up during the past two or three years in anticipation of free sugar. Now that the likelihood of free sugar in the next few years is practically past, the fund will be kept nearly intact for the purpose of meeting this or other unforeseen vicissitudes. The fund, however, is deemed large enough by most of the plantations, so the stockholders in most instances can reasonably expect a full distribution of 1916 earnings, which promise to break all records. The amount of the cash balances on hand December 31, 1915, were:

Ewa	\$593,000
Hawaiian Agricultural	600,000
Hawaiian C. & S. Co.	1,316,000
Hawaiian Sugar	550,000
Honoum	240,000
Kekaha	390,000
Koloa	90,000
Maui Agricultural	1,122,000
McBryde	71,000
Olau	453,000
Oahu Sugar	1,000,000
Onomea	715,000
Pepeekeo	400,000
Pioneer	415,000
Wailua	398,000
Wailuku	400,000
Total	8,751,000

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. President, how can it be contended that the extension of this duty is essential to the existence or even to the welfare of this great industry? I am aware that it is said we must not estimate or legislate with regard to existing conditions which are phenomenal, and I admit that they are unusual. I am aware also that it is said that unless this legislation shall proceed these industries will wither away and perish with the return of peace.

Mr. President, if the Great Western Sugar Co., with its \$20,000,000 of surplus, and if the other beet-sugar companies with their millions of surplus, and if the sugar companies in the insular possessions with their millions upon millions of surplus are to perish and to disappear when peace shall again gladden the earth with her presence, unless their power to levy toll upon the American people shall be prolonged, then they constitute industries which ought to perish, because it is evident that if prolonged it is only a question of time when they will absorb into their treasuries all that remains worth absorbing not already acquired by similar huge institutions also basking in the sunshine of prosperity consequent upon the suffering and desolation of Europe.

In my section of the country, Mr. President, sugar companies occupy a peculiar advantage. They have capitalized not only the tariff and capitalized the future in their common stock, but as I directed the attention of the Senate two years ago, they have also capitalized inequalities in transportation rates, all of them working to the disadvantage of the consumers in the beet-sugar producing region.

Mr. President, there is a close and indissoluble connection between the great transportation companies of the United States and those huge industries which dominate almost every avenue of human effort and enterprise. Through the conjunction of the control of big business with the control of transportation lines throughout the country competition becomes impossible, and the coexistence of others engaged in the same lines of business is one of grace and of kindly consideration, dependent on good behavior. Equal right to the channels of trade for legitimate competition no longer survives.

It is a singular fact that this industry, about which my distinguished friend from Nevada is so concerned, the beet-sugar industry, has, in conjunction with the American Sugar Refining Co., its principal shareholder, so cunningly devised and manipulated railroad rates as to enjoy a tremendous advantage over the people who are said to enjoy the benefits of this protective duty in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and Idaho; and I may assure you that the advantage is pressed to the limit.

For example, the rate upon 100 pounds of sugar from Denver to San Francisco, although it is down grade practically all the way, is 30 cents a hundred higher than the rate upon sugar from San Francisco to Denver. The rates upon sugar from Denver to the common points of the Missouri River are similarly arranged. James J. Hill once said that you could kick a barrel of flour and start it rolling in Minneapolis and it would of its own volition roll clear to New Orleans. I might paraphrase this statement by saying that you could kick a barrel of sugar in Denver and start it rolling and it would reach Galveston of its own volition. Yet the rates from Denver to Galveston upon practically all commodities, including such commodities as sugar, are greater than the rates for the same commodities from Galveston to Denver, up grade all the way.

Mr. President, it is generally supposed to be a law of economics that where the supply of a given article glut the market the price falls. The sugar companies in Colorado produce several times as much sugar as can be consumed there, but the price does not fall worth a cent. On the contrary, the price rises, and we actually pay more for the sugar consumed in the States I have mentioned than in any other part of the United States. This is made possible by the scheme of freight manipulation to which I have adverted.

I have prepared a table which I here insert based upon sugar at \$6.90 in New York, wholesale, giving the wholesale price in different parts of the country, among others at Denver:

CANE.		Cents.
San Francisco	7.10
Phoenix, Ariz.	7.55
Denver, Colo.	7.45
Billings, Mont.	7.85
Carson City, Nev.	7.55
Boise, Idaho	7.85
Sante Fe, N. Mex.	7.45
Omaha, Nebr.	7.23
Seattle, Wash.	7.05
Portland, Oreg.	7.25
Cheyenne, Wyo.	7.45
Topeka, Kans.	7.33
Des Moines, Iowa	7.25
Pierre, S. Dak.	7.43
Bismarck, N. Dak.	7.63
BEET.		
San Francisco	6.90
Phoenix, Ariz.	7.35
Denver, Colo.	7.25
Billings, Mont.	7.65
Carson City, Nev.	7.35
Boise, Idaho	7.65
Sante Fe, N. Mex.	7.25
Omaha, Nebr.	7.03
Seattle, Wash.	6.85
Portland, Oreg.	7.05
Cheyenne, Wyo.	7.25
Topeka, Kans.	7.13
Des Moines, Iowa	7.15
Pierre, S. Dak.	7.23
Bismarck, N. Dak.	7.43

With sugar at \$6.90 in New York, cane sugar is \$7.45 in Denver and beet sugar is \$7.25 in Denver. In Billings, Mont., is located one of the largest factories of the Great Western Sugar Co. It produces many thousands of tons of sugar every year. It produces so much, indeed, that it is supposed by its owners to be in a chronic danger of bankruptcy when the question of tariff is agitated. With sugar in New York at \$6.90, cane sugar at Billings is \$7.85 and beet sugar is \$7.65, with the result, Mr. President, that beet sugar manufactured at Billings or at Longmont or any other point in my own and adjoining States can be purchased by the consumer at Omaha and Kansas City, who can then pay the freight upon it to the point of consumption for less than it can be obtained at the very door of the factory producing it.

The amount in round numbers of this added charge, upon the basis of 80 pounds of sugar per capita, to the people of my State is about \$250,000 per annum. Calculate what that has aggregated in the last 16 years, during which time the system has been in operation, and then add a similar tax upon the people of Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana, for the same period, and some faint conception may be formed of the tremendous aggregate burden placed upon the people of that section of the country where sugar is produced more abundantly than elsewhere, wrung from them by the skillful and shrewd manipulation of transportation rates which operate as an added protective tariff, then ask what claim this industry has upon the American Congress. I am afraid the burden will be upon us always unless the Government, realizing the impossibility of changing these conditions by what it calls control, shall take over the great lines of transportation and operate them, as they should be operated, on terms of equality for all the people.

Mr. President, this intolerable situation is made possible by the cooperation of the American Sugar Refining Co., which, as

I have stated, is the largest single shareholder of the bulk of these concerns. It could end the practice if it would by the mere threat of competition.

It was stated, I think on the floor, somewhere in my presence, that the interest acquired a good many years ago in the beet-sugar companies by the American Sugar Refining Co. had been disposed of and that the American Sugar Refining Co. is at present arrayed against the beet companies and the ardent advocate of free sugar. Indeed, that bugaboo has been paraded before the eyes of the American people ever since the Democratic Party came into power in 1912 and directed its attention to a rectification of the abuses consequent upon the existence of this tariff.

The contrary is the fact, Mr. President. This concern deliberately set about securing control of the beet-sugar industry as far back as 1902. In a speech which I delivered upon this floor in September, 1913, I gave the details of the transaction and how it was accomplished. It is not necessary here to recapitulate them. Suffice it to say that at that time I inserted in the RECORD extracts from hearings upon the subject demonstrating that the American Sugar Refining Co. was largely interested in beet-sugar companies, which produced about 54 per cent of all the beet sugar in the United States, the interest of the refining company in these companies being approximately 42 per cent, or virtual control. The total amount in dollars of the holdings at that time was stated to be, in round numbers, about \$23,500,000. In the recent annual report dated March 8, 1916, of the American Sugar Refining Co., I find this statement:

INCOME FROM INVESTMENTS.

The profit and loss account shows a larger return on "Income from investments" than in 1914. This is owing to larger dividend returns from its holdings of beet-sugar stocks, which companies as producers of their own raw material have prospered greatly with the higher range of prices. There has been a corresponding and substantial increase in the market value of these beet-sugar holdings which, however, have not been reappraised in the item of "Investments general," where they are carried at the same value as in former years. While the company during the last few years has disposed of certain beet-sugar stocks, as opportunity offered, and has so reported to its stockholders, it still has an interest in seven companies acquired many years ago and now carried for investment purposes solely.

If we turn now to its comparative statement for the years 1913, 1914, and 1915 it will be perceived that the profit from its own operations, that is to say the profit from the active and direct business of the company for 1915 were but \$2,991,465.39. But its income from investments was \$2,312,646.21, and the amount of its general investments are there stated as \$22,577,772, or within a million dollars of the amount stated in 1913 as the total par value of all its holdings in beet-sugar companies. Evidently it has disposed of a very small proportion of these investments.

Now, Mr. President, I think that our common experience of human nature will tell us, if, indeed, that were necessary, that the investment of a great concern like the American Sugar Refining Co., producing an income in an amount which is the equivalent of that derived, its own business would hardly be antagonistic to the continuance of a protective duty, the existence of which is so very necessary to the preservation thereof.

But, Mr. President, we have the positive statement of Mr. Atkinson, now, I think, the president of that company, made before one of the committees of Congress, expressly declaring that the company was not identified with the free-sugar movement and was opposed to it, although he believed that some reduction of duty might be made.

There are companies, Mr. President, which are advocates of free sugar and which are engaged in the refining business, but to say that the American Sugar Refining Co., the greatest of them all, that huge concern with its millions upon millions of capital, controlling a majority of the sugar consumption of the United States, practically in control of seven of the great beet-sugar companies of the United States, which it acquired that competition with them might end, is advocating a policy or assuming a position antagonistic to its own expressed interests, is to assume something which is certainly not consistent with its general practice or with the laws of commercial procedure.

I have here, Mr. President, a statement of the refiners in the United States who favor free sugar, those who are undeclared, and those who are opposed to free sugar, which, at this point in my remarks, I ask leave to insert without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

REFINERS IN THE UNITED STATES FAVORING FREE SUGAR.

Federal Sugar Refining Co., New York.
Arbuckle Sugar Refining Co., New York.
Combined refining capacity, 15,000 barrels daily.

REFINERS IN THE UNITED STATES UNDECLARED BUT PROBABLY FAVORING FREE SUGAR.

Revere Sugar Refining Co., Boston.
Warner Sugar Refining Co., New York; in favor of moderate tariff before last Ways and Means Committee (1911).
McCahn Sugar Refining Co., Philadelphia.
Pennsylvania Sugar Refining Co., Philadelphia.
Combined refining capacity, 12,500 barrels daily.

REFINERS IN THE UNITED STATES OPPOSED TO FREE SUGAR.

American Sugar Refining Co., Boston.
National Sugar Refining Co., Long Island City.
National Sugar Refining Co., Yonkers.
American Sugar Refining Co., Brooklyn.
American Sugar Refining Co., Jersey City.
American Sugar Refining Co., Philadelphia.
American Sugar Refining Co., New Orleans.
Colonial Sugar Refining Co., New Orleans.
Henderson Sugar Refining Co., New Orleans.
C. & H. Sugar Refining Co., San Francisco.
Western Sugar Refining Co., San Francisco.
Combined refining capacity, 57,000 barrels daily.

NOTE.—The Revere, McCahn, and Pennsylvania Sugar Refining companies, while undeclared, probably would not oppose "free sugar" because, so far as I know, they make no special profits as the result of the tariff. The reasons for "opposed to free sugar" are clearly evident, as the companies named have, directly or indirectly, connections that make substantial profits because of the tariff.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I deny broadly that any duty whatever is essential to the continuation or the prosperity of the beet-sugar industry, and I base this denial, Mr. President, in some degree upon the statements and admissions of men connected with the industry from its inception and to which I had occasion to advert some two years ago. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] declares that inasmuch as Cuba can lay down sugar in the United States at 2 cents and inasmuch as the beet-sugar companies can not manufacture sugar at any such price a duty is necessary, if the latter pursuit is to continue.

Mr. President, upon the assumption that these figures are correct the conclusion drawn by the Senator is obvious. Conceding for a moment for the sake of the argument that they are correct, let me ask what great calamity would result to this country if its hundred million people could secure this prime necessity of life for a trifle over 2 cents a pound? Think of the saving to them if, indeed, it were true that from an isle of the sea near to our shores this great blessing were possible, and think, Mr. President, of what could be accomplished by diverting the capital and the labor now connected with this highly-protected industry into other sources of desirable production. To my mind, those conditions are not at all undesirable, and I would welcome the day when every necessity of life essential to the existence of human kind could be reduced in proportion, so that they would in abundance be within the reach of every man, every woman, and every child in the Nation. It is to me a much more pleasing prospect than the levying of a tax upon every stick of candy in the baby fingers of every child in this country in order that these huge concerns with their millions may add to their vast possessions year after year.

But, Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Nevada knows, and I am sure that I do not, what the cost of Cuban sugar or of beet-sugar production in this country is. I know that Mr. Oxnard said in 1899 that with sugar at 4 cents a pound he could make enormous returns upon his proposed investment, and I am satisfied that he enlisted a good deal of capital upon the faith of that statement. I know that such a thing as the cost of a pound of beet sugar is impossible of definite calculation. You can get it, if you please, in one factory to-day, but the price in that very factory may vary to-morrow; you can get an average, if you please, in half a dozen factories; but to say that it is possible either in Cuba or in the United States to ascertain and fix a definite cost or an actual cost of sugar production is to make a statement which I think, Mr. President, it is impossible to support.

In all of the calculations that I have seen upon the subject—and I have seen a good many—I have discovered no allowance for by-products, no allowance for efficiency in the factory force or the lack of it, no allowance based on the sugar content of the beet, nor in the wear and tear, which is an essential factor in the matter of cost, nor have I ever been able to see a balance sheet showing the actual amount of expenditure and the actual amount of receipts, between which is the difference of profits, from which the cost can be intelligently calculated.

I recall, Mr. President, that when the Hardwick committee was in session the chairman demanded from some of the witnesses before that committee a statement of the cost of beet-sugar production, and Mr. Truman G. Palmer, then the expert and the representative of the beet-sugar companies, in writing upon the subject to Mr. Charles C. Hamlin, also a representative of the beet-sugar interests, said that there was no way out of compliance; but instead of calling witnesses to be examined

by the committee he thought it would be better to wait until the hearing was over and then issue a circular calling attention to it—a most disingenuous way, putting it mildly, of meeting a demand of the chairman of an important committee regarding a subject absolutely essential to a proper understanding of the situation.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate in going in detail into this matter of the cost of production; but I assert now, as I asserted then, that whatever the effect may be in other sections of the country, the great arid and semiarid regions of the West, including California, the natural home of this industry, can produce beet sugar at an ample profit upon the capital actually invested without any protection whatever. Nature has furnished conditions there, Mr. President, which constitute the best possible protection and which legislation can not affect or destroy.

The sugar beet is a peculiar vegetable. In its initial stages of growth it needs a great deal of water; in its medium stages of growth it needs very little; during the sugar-forming period it needs none. Our system of irrigation enables us to regulate this demand of the plant so that at its various stages of growth and maturity it may be supplied with precisely the moisture that it needs. It is not there subject to the conditions of a more humid region, which is liable to periods of undue moisture and of undue drought. That element is the subject of artificial regulation. It needs constant sunshine; and out in that region there are from 300 to 320 days of sunshine every year. It needs cool nights, and at that altitude, more than a mile above sea level, the nights are always deliciously cool, however sultry the weather may be at midday.

Those conditions, Mr. President, will ultimately assert, indeed they are now asserting, themselves as against the industry in other sections. A good many factories have been built in some of the States farther east, in some of the humid States; built sometimes for purposes of speculation, sometimes for political reasons, as was the case of the factory in Iowa, which, according to the lobby hearings, was built more to affect and influence the attitude of the then senior Senator from Iowa, Mr. Allison, than to make sugar for the multitude. His State being interested in this great industry through the erection of a lonely plant, he would naturally want to protect it. Other great factories have been built in unfavorable sections and in the best of faith. They can not compete with the conditions to which I have adverted, even with a tariff that might be specially designed for their protection. Hence, I say, that in the natural progress of the development and growth of an industry these natural, necessary, and superior advantages must assert themselves, and in the course of time all of the production will be gathered into that region. Indeed, that gathering process has been in evidence for some time. A large number of the factories in my State have been transplanted from Michigan, from Wisconsin, and from Nebraska; a large number of those in other of the arid States have been transplanted from other sections in order to get the advantage, the absolutely necessary advantage, of these natural conditions.

To say, therefore, that these huge concerns, with their treasures bursting, Mr. President, with millions, and which are dropsical with watered stock, need an extension for four years more of the duty of 1 cent per pound, or need it indefinitely, if they are to exist at all, does not comport with the actual conditions, and never did.

My distinguished friend from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] declares that beet sugar is entitled to fair protection. He believes it, and he doubtless thinks that this bill gives fair protection if we should accept its provisions as it came from the House.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado will find that I insisted that this agricultural product should receive the same fair treatment as is received by other agricultural products, and inasmuch as almost all the agricultural products of the humid region are upon the dutiable list, it would be unfair to put this agricultural product, which is especially the product of the arid and semiarid regions, upon the free list. I did not say that it was entitled to protection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Nevada has corrected me, as I do not desire to misrepresent him. The note which I took during the course of his remarks is that "beet sugar is entitled to as fair protection as other agricultural products are." I was coming to that. I think the Senator, who has been in public life for a long time, knows that this so-called system of protection of purely agricultural products is the veriest of all the humbugs of protection.

Why, Mr. President, think of a protective duty in this country on potatoes and wheat and asparagus and eggs and other commodities, of which we produce an abundance and much of which we export. That is merely the sop, the tub, thrown to the farmer while by the protectionist of the past, and, unfortunately, many of the farmers have been deceived and deluded into a false sense of security in consequence of it. They actually think it does them good. Why, during the consideration of the Canadian reciprocity bill we were face to face with the remarkable spectacle that the farmers of the United States were going to be ruined if we had reciprocity with Canada, and that the farmers of Canada were going to be ruined if they had reciprocity with America. That condition of things, Mr. President, absurd as it was, actually found a serious lodgment in many minds, notwithstanding the ruin so freely prophesied was due to the resulting prosperity and monopoly of trade in agricultural products by the other.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Senator from Colorado will bear in mind, however, that the duties to which I referred upon the agricultural products of the humid region were not duties that were imposed upon them by a Republican tariff, but are the duties that are imposed by a Democratic tariff.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator from Nevada mean to say that the Republican Party did not impose those duties?

Mr. NEWLANDS. They did, yes; but they were maintained by the Democratic Party, and I insist—

Mr. THOMAS. They did impose those duties, and we did not have the courage of our convictions and remove them all. They perform no function save to encumber the statute books.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We reduced them, however, by about 50 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. As I said before, these were designed to flatter the credulity of the farmers, and, having a great voting agricultural population, we partially continued that protection, because we were unable, in view of our individual differences, to make effective all the reforms in tariff legislation which some of us wanted to make.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado permit me to interrupt him there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Just right there, in connection with what the Senator says—and I admire the Senator's candor; I think he has very properly commented upon this action—I insist upon it, that in whatever method we do act the action shall be fair and proportionate as between different sections of the country.

Mr. THOMAS. In other words—

Mr. NEWLANDS. If we conclude to remain upon a protective basis as to certain agricultural products in the humid regions, where, perhaps, votes are necessary, fairness demands that we shall not drift the agricultural products of another region absolutely to the free list.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator's admission—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment and I will yield. The Senator's position virtually is that because it may seem necessary to protect the potatoes of the Wisconsin or the Michigan farmer, who has a hard time to make a living at all, in order to be fair it is equally necessary that we should protect these huge aggregations of capital which manufacture beet sugar and who now have more money than they know what to do with.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I must yield now to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish the Senator would let me say right there—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor, and declines to yield.

Mr. THOMAS. With the consent of my friend from Idaho, I will give the Senator from Nevada another chance.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish the Senator from Colorado would distinguish between the great aggregations of capital that simply put an agricultural product into shape for consumption and the great agricultural industry itself that produces that product upon the farm.

Mr. THOMAS. I am coming to that.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will join with the Senator from Colorado in any movement that will prevent extortion on the part of great aggregations of capital, that will prevent unjust discrimination as between sections regarding freight rates, and so forth, but I am talking about the basic industry. You can not maintain this industry unless you have beets; and if you produce beets you must have sugar factories, of course; and, however obnoxious they may be to our ideas of monopoly, our prejudice against the monopoly which produces the sugar product should not prevent us from dealing fairly with the basic industry itself.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator, I will say that I am coming to that feature of the situation pretty soon; but I have reached the point where I can not distinguish between the farmer who waters his stock and may therefore need protection and the beet company that waters its stock because of protection.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. In the interest of the rule and precedent, I ask that the Senator from Colorado be permitted to proceed by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will be allowed to proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my friend from Idaho, but if I properly understand the present parliamentary situation, the recent appeal of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] from the ruling of the Chair upon that subject has smashed all previous records and leaves us at liberty to conduct ourselves as we please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair feels that he is bound by that rule, but, by unanimous consent, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada is concerned, and very properly so, for the beet raiser. So am I. He is the man whom I would fain protect, if protection is necessary, and he needs it, but he needs it from the refiners and not from the Congress of the United States; he needs it from the only customer that he has, not from legislation that we may enact; and if we enacted it, Mr. President, it would not amount to much for him, because, as I have stated, all, or nearly all, such legislation designed for the ultimate producer fails usually to realize the hopes of its advocates.

Now, my friend the Senator from Nevada perhaps does not know that, although the price of sugar has advanced from about 4 cents to nearly 8, and will go to 10 cents, although the surpluses of the refiners have advanced from \$2,000,000 and \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000 to \$5,000,000, \$10,000,000, and \$20,000,000; that, although their common stock has advanced from \$4 and \$10 and \$15 up to \$100 and \$150 and \$205 per share, there has been no increase in the prices paid to the Colorado farmer for his beets, and not very much anywhere. The farmer of my State makes to-day what he did before. Rising markets mean nothing to him.

In order to demonstrate this, I shall read a couple of letters which I have received from gentlemen fully acquainted with the conditions in my State. I wanted first-hand information about it before making the statement, and so I wrote them. One is from Mr. Albert Dakan, the attorney of the Beet Growers' Association. His letter is dated March 24, and he says:

Answering yours of the 20th instant, there has been no advance made to the beet grower of northern Colorado by the Great Western Sugar Co. in its 1916 contract. The new contract is the same in price paid for beets as that of 1915.

The other is from Mr. John A. Cross, for many years sheriff of his county, afterwards State senator, and at present postmaster at Loveland, Colo., where one of the great factories of the Great Western Co. is situated. His letter is dated March 23, and is as follows:

DEAR FRIEND THOMAS: Yours received to-night. The Great Western Sugar Co.'s contracts for beets for 1916 are for just the same price that they paid last year; and they paid their laborers at the factory during the last campaign the very lowest wages that they could get men to work for, and we short-handed much of the time, and worked their men very hard. They keep their expenses for labor and production down to the very lowest possible point, while they are making their millions every year.

O Mr. President, if my friend the Senator from Nevada could enact a system of tariff legislation which would be carried past the manufacturer and benefit the man who toils in the field, so that it might shower its blessings upon his product, I would gladly join him; but this sugar tariff is all absorbed long before it reaches the grower.

Now, what is the spectacle? The farmers, working from sunrise to sunset, during the storm and heat and changeable weather conditions, with the expense of living rising in all directions, with fair knowledge of the fact that the company which constitutes his only customer is prospering as such institution never prospered before, must content himself with practically the same compensation, and that barely sufficient to pay the actual cost of production. My recollection, Mr. President—I may not state it accurately—is that it requires about 12 tons of 15 per cent beets to the acre to pay the cost of the farmer's production. What he gets above and beyond that is profit; but that does not take into consideration interest upon his capital or the value of his farm.

Mr. President, paralleling these conditions here, let me turn for a moment to those which prevail in the countries at war. The Government of France has fixed the price which the farmer shall receive for beet roots at \$9.65 per ton. The average here is \$5.50. In Austria-Hungary the price is fixed at \$8.12 per ton minimum. In Belgium—even in poor, desolated Belgium—the German authorities have stipulated a price of \$8.49 per ton. Our Department of Agriculture shows that the average price which the farmer receives in this country is \$5.54, less than the average paid in Germany prior to the war; and yet these concerns, bursting and bulging with enormous and incalculable profits, declare that they can not exist unless we continue the protective duty of 1 cent a pound, which means an added cost of a necessity of life of \$86,000,000 per year to the consumers of this country.

Mr. President, I want to advert now to a phase of the subject of labor cost which I should like my friend, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], to hear, but unfortunately he is not in the Chamber. He has taken a great and laudable interest in the antichild labor bill. He has given the subject great consideration, and is the chief advocate of that measure in this body. His whole heart is in the subject, but his attention has been directed so far, chiefly if not entirely, to the conditions of child labor in the factories of the country, and particularly in the factories of the South. I want to emphasize the fact that, notwithstanding the profits of this industry, notwithstanding its great and unexpected prosperity, child labor is conspicuous in the beet fields of Colorado. It is one basis of productive energy to as great, if not a greater, extent than before the war, and certainly to as great a degree as child labor has ever been exploited in the Southern States.

I shall read, Mr. President, an article from a newspaper, the Denver News, which is entirely devoted to the features of the House bill now under consideration, and which does not approve the position which I, as a Senator from Colorado, occupy toward it.

A few days ago the Rocky Mountain News—I think it was the 12th of March—published an article entitled "Labor in fields retards pupils. Child-labor committee report estimates 5,000 children work in beet industry."

That is in my State, but one of the many Commonwealths engaged in this industry. I will read the article:

Five thousand children are reported to be working in the beet fields of Colorado during the growing season of each year, according to figures given out last week by the national child-labor committee. School-teachers and the national child-labor committee, as well as other authorities, have been gathering information on this subject for some years, a part of which has been made into reports.

The committee declares that the children are overworked in the fields, so much so that their progress in their studies is seriously hampered.

The children are used principally in caring for the beets while they are growing. The farmer who contracts with the beet-sugar factory to grow a certain number of acres is told that he must place a proportionate number of persons upon the tract. If he has 20 acres, he will require a certain number of laborers; if 40 acres, he must have twice the number. The work of thinning, cultivating, topping, and irrigating the beets is done by contract, the head of a family being paid a certain price per acre—from \$18 to \$20—for the work.

The first subhead is:

SIX-YEAR-OLD CHILDREN WORK.

Russian men usually contract to do the work, and when the farmer looks about for some one to engage for the summer, he inquires for a family with the number of members to correspond with that required for the work. Ordinarily the contract is made for a father, mother, and children to make up the required number.

The age of the children is said to be taken into consideration under the contract, and those of tender years are not expected to do any of the field work. But the real working of the system is declared, both by teachers in the Denver public schools and by others who have investigated the matter, to be that the children of 6 years are sent into the fields. Those from 8 to 10 are said to be employed constantly during the weeding, thinning, and topping seasons.

An investigator states that he had found the practice has been for work to commence in the fields as early as 3 o'clock in the morning, when the first sign of day begins to peep in from the east.

Six-year-old children at 3 o'clock in the morning begin their daily toil.

The next subhead is:

SEVENTEEN HOURS OF LABOR.

At 7 o'clock the workers have breakfast, sometimes going to the "Russian house" for it and sometimes it being served in the fields, so that the labor does not cease. Again at noon the workers are fed in the same way, being allowed a half hour for that purpose. They take their supper at about 6 o'clock and return to their labors, staying out in the fields until 8 o'clock at night, or even later.

The average hours of work for children in the fields is declared to be about 17 during the busiest seasons.

One abuse of the system that investigators say they have discovered results in a charge of peonage. This is that if the family desiring to take a contract for the handling of the beets upon a farm is not as large as required under the rules, the head of the house hires children from other families.

Sometimes the farmer does the managing himself, hiring men, women, and children to do the actual labor.

I am satisfied, Mr. President, that this statement does not apply to the American farmer. A great many of the farm workers in the beet field, who are emigrants from Russia, Bohemia, and other countries, having acquired money sufficient to make an initial payment, purchase lands of their own and engage largely in the work of raising beets and work their children upon their farms. Such is my information.

The work of thinning and weeding is done on the knees, usually in soil that was irrigated the day before or maybe only a few hours before, and is wet and cold.

Denver teachers who have had charge of children used in the fields during the summer state that the work keeps the youths out of school during two months of the year set apart for their education. The teachers also say that children come in from the fields so worn out as to be unable to do satisfactory studying for several weeks. The effect is that they practically lose about four months of the school year, and are kept in grades twice as long as those who are able to attend regularly.

One teacher in the Denver schools received the following letter from a pupil who had been hired from a city family to do work in the fields during the summer:

"DEAR TEACHER: It is rainy to-day so I could write you a letter. We was working very, very hard the last two weeks, and we did work last Sunday, too, because beets grow so fast.

"We get up in the morning 3 o'clock every day and we work till 12 o'clock, then we have our dinner about half an hour, and then we go to work till 7.15, so we worked about 15 or 16 hours. Oh, it's too hard! I wish I didn't have to go any more to work beets and could spend my time in school. School is what I like, but I have to make my living to work so hard."

The next subhead is:

WALKS 80 MILES ON KNEES.

"Four of us worked 60 acres of beets, and in this month I have to walk on my knees 80 miles, and thin the beets at the same time, and to hoe that 80 miles, it takes me to do it about 34 days. I get \$6 an acre to block and thin, so I make \$90. But it's too hard to walk that 80 miles on your knees on hot summer days. I get sleep about six hours a day, and you know it isn't enough for that kind of job.

"Soon as I lay in a bed I am sleeping in about three minutes, and I never wake up until our clock strikes to alarm. I am glad it's raining to-day so I could rest a little. I am going to make our dinner now, and after dinner I am going to sleep.

"I tell you everything about hard work when I come to Denver." The report of the National Labor Committee says that the children between 7 and 15 employed yearly in the sugar-beet fields of Colorado, according to estimates made by the superintendent of schools, lose two or more school months as a result.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. What discount is given by the sugar mills out there upon the sugar which is consumed by these little children?

Mr. THOMAS. Alas! Mr. President, no discount is given, either to them or to anybody else. These companies are absolutely democratic when it comes to discounts. All consumers look alike to them.

SCHOOL WORK SERIOUSLY AFFECTED.

That the loss of schooling seriously affects the progress of the beet workers in school is shown by the fact that the average per cent of retardation among the beet workers is 53 per cent as compared with an average of 20 per cent for the nonbeet workers, says the report.

The work the children do in "pulling" and "topping" the beets involves great physical strain when continued for 12 hours a day throughout the harvesting season.

The report states that compared with the total number of persons engaged in beet culture, the number of children under 14 employed is small, and that therefore the industry would not suffer if they were eliminated.

The compulsory education law is not enforced in the beet sections, and the report recommends the reorganization of the school system on a county unit instead of a district basis to secure enforcement of the law by removing it from local influence, and thus control the employment of children in the beet fields.

Mr. SMOOT. Who is the author of the letter? Will the Senator say?

Mr. THOMAS. This is taken from the Rocky Mountain News of March 12. It is attributed to "inquiries made by the national child-labor committee of school teachers as well as other authorities."

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know how it is in Colorado or the other States, but I do know that the laws in my State compelling children to go to school are absolutely enforced.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, of course I accept the Senator's statement; and yet I think he will admit that children are employed to work long hours in the beet fields of Utah just as they are in the other beet-sugar States of the West.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina. I will yield to the Senator from Utah in just a moment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I simply wanted to ask the Senator from Colorado if the supervision of these children is included in the Keating child-labor bill?

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator must answer his own question, because I think he knows more about that bill than I do, as I have not yet read it. My impression, however, from the discussion which accompanied the remarks of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] is that it does not include agricultural laborers.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I will simply say to the Senator, in answer to what he has stated, that the children in the State of Utah do work in the beet fields for the thinning of beets only. It is the easiest work that a child can do. It is the most healthy work that a child can do, because he is out of doors. They are all paid so much per row. I have never heard anybody, either a parent or anyone else in the State, complain of the work; but I do know that it is a most profitable work for a child, and has done a great deal of good toward keeping children off the street, and has brought in a fair income to the child; and in many cases it is the means of starting a savings account that grows each year.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator inform me how many hours the children work in his State?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think they work over eight or nine hours a day. Mr. President—none that I know of.

Mr. THOMAS. I am glad to know that.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. Is the number of hours limited by statute in the Senator's State as to child labor on the farms?

Mr. SMOOT. No; not on the farms.

Mr. POMERENE. Or in the beet fields?

Mr. SMOOT. But I will say this to the Senator: In our State the children mostly help the father upon the farm. So many of them are beet growers. They all have small patches to cultivate. There are no great, large acreages of beets grown in the State of Utah. Some of them have an acre, some of them 2, hardly any of them above 10 acres. The father takes the children with him during the thinning of the beets, and the children thin the beets while he is doing the other necessary hard work in connection with the cultivation of the beets.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very glad to learn that the State of Utah seems to be a shining exception to this situation, and I wish its example could be copied, and copied at once, by the adjoining States. In my State, and I think in some of the others, the work to which I am now referring is done largely by Mexicans and their children, by Russians and their children, by Bohemians and their children. They work in colonies, living somewhere in the towns during the winter season, and exploiting the beet fields in companies during the summer.

As to the extent to which this practice goes, I am unable to say; but I feel sure that in the State from which I hail, which yields one-third of all the beet sugar produced in the United States, whose refiners are to-day the owners of more millions than they ever imagined in their wildest dreams of accumulation, do not stand very well before the American public in pleading for a continuation of this tax, when it is evident that they not only pay the farmer no more for his beets than they did before, they not only do not pay their factory workers any more than they did before, but they obtain the benefit of, if they are not directly responsible for, the exploitation of little children working 14 to 17 hours a day in the production of the crop which is essential to their industry. They do not appeal to me, Mr. President, in the light of these facts, even if it were necessary that we should tax 100,000,000 people indefinitely, to the end that they may continue to prosper.

I have said more perhaps than I had intended to say upon this subject. I felt it my duty to give expression to my views with regard to the expediency of this proposed legislation, largely because I represent in small degree that section of the

country which is interested in the subject. I believe that these facts should be laid before the public in order that they may properly judge of the wisdom or propriety of our action in postponing the operation of this law.

Mr. President, the enormous profits which these companies are reaping from our people through the agonies of Europe, and the consequent change of business conditions, pay but little of the taxes levied for the support of the States where they operate, and practically none at all upon their surplus. Those with which I am familiar are organized in the State of New Jersey, where their tax is regulated with regard to the amount of their capitalization. The taxes which they pay in my State are paid upon their visible property. I think the only tax which they pay upon their vast accumulations of money is the 1 per cent exacted by our Federal income-tax law.

We need revenue, Mr. President, and need it badly. We are going to expand the area of our expenditures, and therefore we shall be obliged to increase taxation far beyond its present extent. I believe that a tax of 5 per cent upon these enormous profits, or 10 per cent, if you please—a tax upon the accumulated wealth of the country—is far more just and far more desirable at this supreme moment in the national affairs than the extension of a tax upon an absolute necessity of life, only one half of which we realize; the other half going to swell the millions of these big and favored institutions.

I would that it were possible to-day to substitute for the Senate bill an increase of the income tax upon these huge concerns, and thereby compel wealth to pay a more equal portion, a more just portion, of the revenues needed in the operations of our Government. The committee of which I am a member have decided otherwise. With much reluctance, I have accepted the compromise which they have offered; and if I cast my vote at all, I shall feel compelled to support it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee announced in his opening statement as one of the reasons for continuing the law the fact that the Republicans had placed sugar upon the free list in 1890. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that while sugar was placed upon the free list in the act of 1890, yet, to encourage the production of beet, sorghum, or cane sugar in this country, a bounty of 2 cents a pound was to be paid upon beet, sorghum, or cane sugar produced within the United States. In addition to that there was a provision to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing and exporting sugar, molasses, coffee, and other products, and if any country failed or refused to enter into satisfactory arrangements with this country the importation of sugar from that country should pay a duty.

In 1890 the production of beet sugar in this country amounted to only 2,353,568 pounds, while the production in 1915 amounted to 1,328,000,000 pounds. I think the great increase in the production of beet sugar under the protective system of the Republican Party is evidence of what may be done with that industry if it is properly protected.

I do not blame the other side for continuing this law for four years. I should be pleased if the majority would remove the limitation and agree to the House bill which repeals the law, and, for one, I shall support the House provision in preference to the Senate provision. But I am not criticizing the Senators on the other side, because they need the revenue, and need it badly.

The amount of duty collected on sugar each year has been a great addition to the revenues of the Government. In 1914 the amount collected was about \$61,000,000, while the sugar imported that year upon which a duty was collected amounted to about 5,000,000,000 pounds. There were over 2,000,000,000 pounds of sugar produced in the United States and nearly 2,000,000,000 pounds were brought from the noncontiguous territories of the United States—Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. When it is remembered that the ordinary receipts of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1915, including over \$39,000,000 corporation income tax, over \$41,000,000 individual income tax, and \$52,000,000 emergency or war tax, amounted to over \$697,000,000, and the ordinary disbursements for that year amounted to \$731,000,000, which left a deficit for the year of over \$33,000,000, it is not surprising that the Democratic majority should desire to have the benefit of a duty on sugar. They need it, and need it badly.

It must be remembered that the deficit for the fiscal year to date is nearly \$53,000,000, and it is estimated that it will amount to over \$64,000,000 by June 30, 1916; and it is estimated by the department that the excess of appropriations, exclusive of deficiencies and miscellaneous, over estimated revenues for the year ending June 30, 1917, will amount to over \$366,000,000, and the increased estimates for 1917 over the same for 1916 amount to more than \$195,000,000. It will be noticed that the

deficiencies have been excluded from the estimates by the department; and you will agree that it is wise to exclude them when you remember that this administration has already presented three emergency deficiency measures at this session of Congress, when heretofore one such measure has usually answered the purpose of the department at one session.

Personally I am very sorry that the Senate Committee on Finance amended the House bill and limited its operation to four years. I should like to see a duty on sugar, for I believe in protecting that industry, and believe that if properly protected it will not be long until all the sugar consumed in the United States will be produced in this country. The great increase in the production of beet sugar justifies this prediction. Ten years ago there was produced in the United States only about 600,000,000 pounds of beet sugar, while in 1914 the production amounted to over 1,000,000,000 pounds.

The chairman of the committee stated that this additional revenue was needed, and left, or at least tried to leave, the impression that it was because of the great decrease of revenues collected and the conditions brought about by the war. An examination of the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury will show that under the change the loss in revenue from customs in 1915, as compared with 1913, was only \$109,000,000, while there was collected in corporation income tax, individual income tax, and emergency or war-revenue tax \$133,262,884 in the year 1915. It seems to me that, instead of laying this matter upon the war, Senators on the other side ought to be honest and say that it is brought about by the mistake they made when they wrote the Underwood law upon the statute books of this country.

I shall vote for the House bill because I believe in the American system of protection; and if the Senators on the other side were fair in their contention instead of voting for this measure they would do what was suggested by the Senator from Colorado a few moments ago and lay the duties upon some other articles. I congratulate the majority in coming over at least to four years of protection; and I hope that before the vote occurs to-morrow they will agree to the House bill and let it go through instead of supporting the Senate amendment, which continues the duty on sugar for four years.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Husting	Oliver	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Jones	Owen	Smoot
Bryan	Kenyon	Page	Sterling
Burleigh	La Follette	Phelan	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Lane	Pittman	Swanson
Chilton	Lewis	Polindexter	Thompson
Clapp	Lippitt	Pomerene	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Reed	Underwood
Colt	McCumber	Robinson	Vardaman
Curtis	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Warren
Hardwick	Myers	Sherman	Williams
Hitchcock	Nelson	Shields	Works
Hollis	Newlands	Simmons	
Hughes	Norris	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND], who is detained from the Senate on account of illness in his family. I should like to have this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-two Senators have responded to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent agreement provides that the vote shall be taken not later than 5 o'clock to-morrow upon the pending bill. I wish to say to the Senator from North Carolina that I understand there are some Senators who desire to speak to-morrow. I do not particularly care if I speak this afternoon or not, or whether I speak at all. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] I think wants to be heard, and we shall have ample time to-morrow to dispose of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the calendar under Rule VIII and consider bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I rose to respond to the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to state that if there is any Senator on either side of the Chamber who desires to speak upon the pending bill I will object to the request of the Senator from Utah, but if there is no Senator who desires to speak I would not feel disposed to object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Utah will ask unanimous consent simply to take up the calendar, I shall not object, but if he asks unanimous consent to consider only such bills as are upon the calendar that no Member shall choose to object to I shall object to that request.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to state to the Senator from Mississippi that there are 18 pages of bills now on the calendar to be considered under Rule VIII. At least 99 per cent of them could probably be passed this afternoon if we proceed to the calendar under Rule VIII and consider only unobjected cases, but if we proceed under Rule VIII the very first bill on the calendar is a bill to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, and no doubt it would take the afternoon to dispose of that bill and perhaps longer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is not the effect of my objection. My objection to this method of proceeding is that whenever there is any bill of any real importance upon the calendar to which one, two, three, four, or five Senators may object, but to which, it is hoped, a majority of the Senators would not object, and which might be passed, it is passed over from day to day indefinitely and is never considered, and the only measures that are taken up are local bills of one sort and another in which no one is interested except those in the neighborhood or from the particular State or section, and they are gotten out of the way, while if a bill is of some importance and you get it off the calendar you have something off the calendar finally. We ought, in fact, in this body to have one calendar day every week or every two weeks, at any rate, for the consideration of nothing but the calendar, and I hope the Committee on Rules, before many weeks, will report such a rule, but I shall object to merely the consideration of such bills as are not objected to. I think the power of one man in the Senate is too extensive, anyhow, and I do not care to accentuate it.

Mr. OVERMAN. If it is the Senator's idea to get a bill through to which Senators object, we would not make any headway with the calendar. We would continue just on that one bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we are to go to the calendar this afternoon, it ought to be for the consideration of some of the important bills that are upon the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from Mississippi is going to object there is no need of discussing it further. I wish to say to the Senator that many bills on the calendar must go to the House and be passed by the House, and if bills to which there is objection are held back here there may not be any action on those measures to which there is no objection, and I fear the legislation will fail in the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will not object to them when they are reached in regular order.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand that the Senator from Mississippi objects?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator understands it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts is going to take the floor.

Mr. LODGE. No; I have no desire to make a speech on the sugar bill. At the appropriate time I intend to offer as an amendment a provision in regard to dyestuffs. I shall not debate it at any length. I will offer that amendment now and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the bill by inserting the following:

That on and after the day following the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the articles named herein when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions, except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila, the rates of duties which are herein prescribed, namely:

DUTYABLE LIST.

First. All products of coal, produced in commercial quantities through the destructive distillation of coal or otherwise, such as benzol, toluol, xylol, cumol, naphthalin, methylnaphthalin, azenaphten, fluorin, anthracene, phenol, cresol, pyridin, chinolin, carbazol, and other not specially provided for and not colors or dyes, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Second. All the so-called "intermediates," made from the products referred to in paragraph 1, not colors or dyes, not specially provided for, 33 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.

Third. All colors or dyes derived from coal, 7½ cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem.

FREE LIST.

Fourth. Acids: Acetic or pyroligneous, arsenic or arsenious, chromic, fluoric, hydrofluoric, hydrochloric or muriatic, nitric, phosphoric, prussic, silicic, sulphuric or oil of vitriol, and valerianic.

Fifth. Coal tar, crude, pitch of coal tar, wood or other tar, dead or creosote oil.

Sixth. Indigo, natural.

SEC. 2. That paragraphs 20, 21, 22, and 23 of Schedule A of section 1 of an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved 9 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m. October 3, 1913, and paragraphs 387, 394, 452, and 514

of the "free list" of section 1 of said act, and so much of any heretofore existing law or parts of law as may be inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. LODGE. I move that as a new section to be added to the amendment proposed by the committee.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 222 on the calendar, being the bill (S. 4856) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber if there is any objection to our proceeding to vote upon the amendment to the sugar bill and upon the bill now. Under the unanimous-consent agreement we are to vote not later than 5 o'clock to-morrow. I assume that we could consistently with the rule vote now, and I do not see any reason, if no Senator is ready to speak, why the matter should be put over until to-morrow in order to enable Senators to speak. Why should we not vote now?

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that there are one or two Senators who intend to speak briefly on the bill, but they are not here to speak now and they will be ready to speak to-morrow. Of course the discussion of the Army bill could be carried on until 5 o'clock to-morrow, but I want to assure the Senator that there is no intention whatever to delay the passage of the bill. The only object that I have in the world is to occupy the time of the Senate profitably during the afternoon in passing bills upon the calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it does seem to me, if we intend to pursue that course, we should begin at the top of the calendar, and dispose of bills which are near the top of the calendar first.

Mr. SMOOT. We would not dispose of them this afternoon.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It would begin the disposition of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would a motion to proceed to the calendar take precedence of the motion made by the Senator from Utah to pick out a particular bill on the calendar and proceed to its consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] if he proposes to lay aside what is known as the sugar bill?

Mr. LODGE. That is not the unfinished business.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is not necessary, I think, because under the unanimous-consent agreement we shall have to vote on the bill to-morrow evening not later than 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Utah is first in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does not a motion to proceed to the consideration of the calendar take precedence of a motion to pick out a particular bill on the calendar out of its order and proceed to its consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that the motion of the Senator from Utah is first in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I offer as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Utah a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. That motion can not be made under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Mississippi can not be entertained, it being against the rule. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The motion will not have the effect to displace the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that it does not.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection, then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not in order to substitute for the motion of the Senator from Utah a motion to proceed to the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks not, under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, a point of order. There has been no business transacted since the last call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business having been transacted since the last call of the roll, the question raised by the Senator from Georgia can not be entertained.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Chair rule that it is not in order for me to substitute for the motion of the Senator from Utah a motion to proceed to the consideration of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rules the motion of the Senator from Mississippi is not in order until the motion of the Senator from Utah is disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Even to substitute one bill for another?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that under the rules of the Senate that can not be done. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand the unfinished business was laid aside for the sole purpose of considering the sugar bill. If that be so, I make the point of order that we should go back to the consideration of the Army bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Army bill was laid aside, and it is the unfinished business. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. For that reason I withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] and vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. He is absent on important business, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], and I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I transfer the pair which I have heretofore announced to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and I vote "yea."

Mr. BRYAN (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], he having been called to New York on official business.

Mr. CHILTON. I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] and vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maryland has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Then I will withdraw my vote, having a general pair with that Senator.

Mr. OWEN. Has the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. OWEN. I withhold my vote, being paired with that Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM];

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]; and

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Borah	Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Brandegge	Johnson, Me.	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Jones	Norris	Smoot
Burleigh	Kenyon	Oliver	Sterling
Chamberlain	La Follette	Page	Sutherland
Clapp	Lane	Polindexter	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Colt	Lodge	Saulsbury	Warren
Cummins	McCumber	Sherman	Works

NAYS—24.

Bryan	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Swanson
Chilton	Overman	Shields	Taggart
Hardwick	Phelar	Smith, Ariz.	Thomas
Hollis	Ransdell	Smith, Ga.	Tillman
Husting	Reed	Smith, S. C.	Vardaman
Lewis	Robinson	Stone	Williams

NOT VOTING—36.

Ashurst	Fall	James	Owen
Bankhead	Fletcher	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose
Beckham	Gallinger	Kern	Pittman
Brady	Goff	Lea, Tenn.	Shafroth
Catron	Gore	Lee, Md.	Smith, Md.
Clarke, Ark.	Gronna	McLean	Townsend
Culberson	Harding	Myers	Underwood
Dillingham	Hitchcock	Newlands	Walsh
du Pont	Hughes	O'Gorman	Weeks

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4856) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

It proposes to pension the following persons at the rate given:

Nettie Johnson, widow of John W. Johnson, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

John George Bauer, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Corda P. Gracey, widow of Samuel L. Gracey, late chaplain Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and former widow of Harrison O. Pratt, late of Company M, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$12 per month.

Elizabeth Propson, widow of John Propson, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Sarah E. Marsh, widow of Charles H. Marsh, late of Company D, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Cecilia Murphy, widow of Charles Murphy, late of Battery M, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Andrew H. Nichols, late of Company C, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary E. Norton, widow of Silas M. Norton, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Ann Odell, widow of Thomas Odell, late of Company K, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

William R. Latimer, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rebecca L. Lapaugh, widow of John D. Lapaugh, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Lide Smith, widow of Albert G. Smith, late of Company F, Fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Alice R. Hutchinson, widow of Henry A. Hutchinson, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Mary Pritchard, widow of Claudius B. Pritchard, late of Company I, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of John Pelas, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, \$12 per month.

Henry Brown, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment, and Company A, Seventh Regiment, Delaware Volunteer Infantry, \$21 per month.

Moses Green, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George E. Newall, late first lieutenant Company A, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alice Quigley, widow of Charles Quigley, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Winifred Whitney, helpless and dependent child of Adrial L. Whitney, late of Company C, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, \$12 per month.

Marie A. Smith, widow of Lawrence Smith, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Elizabeth S. Chaplain, former widow of John W. Minton, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and widow of Charles Chaplain, late of Company A, Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Ellen Edwards, widow of Presley Edwards, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Francis M. George, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harvey W. Hoover, late of Company A, First Regiment Mississippi Marine Brigade Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Fry, late of Company G, Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John M. Davidson, late of Company I, Ninety-first Regiment, and Company F, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Justine M. Thrift, widow of William H. Thrift, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and major and additional paymaster, United States Volunteers, War with Spain, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Samuel E. Wilson, late of Company G, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Harper, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary J. White, widow of Albert E. White, late of Company K, Eighty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Elsie A. Platt, widow of Charles Platt, late of Company B, First Battalion Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Adelaide M. Tarbox, widow of George H. Tarbox, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary Whipple, widow of Lucian A. Whipple, late of Company F, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Hannah A. Hill, widow of Robert Hill, late of Company E, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John C. Brown, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Michael Reuss, late of Company H, Sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Waltz, late of Company K, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Moses Hull, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Margaret M. Lane, widow of Marion D. Lane, late of U. S. S. *Grampus*, *Nymph*, and *Hastings*, United States Navy, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

William Crome, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James C. Green, late of Company C, One hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Gowland, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment, and Company M, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John B. Hammer, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Lichtley, late of Company B, Fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Malisa A. Sherk, widow of William Sherk, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, \$12 per month.

Fannie M. Carey, widow of Daniel W. Carey, late of Company I, and principal musician One hundred and third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Nathaniel Haskell, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment Maine Veteran Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edwin J. Walton, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Robert N. B. Simpson, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William O'Neal, late of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Silas Blodgett, late of Company H, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company K, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ella A. Tyler, widow of Benjamin F. Tyler, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Emma J. Beal, widow of Horace W. Beal, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James Beaton, late of Company G, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary C. Knowlton, widow of John O. Knowlton, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Sarah C. Greenfield, widow of John Greenfield, late of Company L, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James H. Moser, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Adelia C. Macauley, widow of Orlando H. Macauley, late captain Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Barney Sancomb, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William P. Nelson, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Marion Kilborn, late of Company I, Ninety-eighth Regiment, and Company H, Sixty-first Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert J. Sprinkle, late of Company B, Eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas White, late of Company E, Twenty-seventh Regiment, and Company C, Thirty-third Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James S. Meek, late captain Company H, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Michael Demuth, late of Company G, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin Simpson, late of Company I, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Aaron Benjamin Waggoner, alias Aaron Benjamin, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Merchant, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company G, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elmira E. Morrison, widow of James W. Morrison, late of Company C, Sixty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Sarah J. Cadle, widow of Richard Cadle, late quartermaster Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Ellen Temperance Smith, helpless and dependent daughter of George W. Smith, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, \$12 per month.

Carrie S. Cross, widow of Samuel K. Cross, late first lieutenant Company A, Second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James Hawkins, late of Company B, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Martha A. Hodges, widow of James L. Hodges, late captain Company K, Third Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Leora L. Macarey, widow of Harlow E. Macarey, late first lieutenant Company K, Twenty-eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Charles Leeder, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John S. Allison, late of Company G, One hundred and sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ida C. Martin, widow of Edwin L. Martin, late of Company K, Fifty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Guy Beebe, late of Company F, Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ellen Lambert, former widow of Robert Lambert, late of Company F, Twenty-eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

George W. Doyle, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harvey D. Plummer, alias Harvey D. Picknell, late of Company H, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin H. Whipple, late of Company B, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Gallup, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Peter Soncrant, late of Company A, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David Moody, jr., late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company I, Twentieth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alphonso W. Longfellow, late of Company C, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Sharpshooters, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Clara P. Boulter, widow of Eugene A. Boulter, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Christian C. Forney, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary A. Moreland, widow of George W. Moreland, late of Company I, Eighty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Rebecca J. Short, widow of Ferdinand E. Short, late of Company C, Thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John L. Short, helpless and dependent child of said Ferdinand E. Short, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Rebecca J. Short, the name of said John L. Short shall be placed on the pension roll at \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Rebecca J. Short.

Mary C. Finlay, widow of Andrew Finlay, late of Companies D and K, Forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of John Dolman, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Annie P. Marchant, widow of Amaziah B. Marchant, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry C. Pennington, late of Company E, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward P. Carman, late of Company F, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sophronia Porter, widow of John W. Porter, late of Company K, Ninety-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Mary E. B. Bruson, formerly Blackmar, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

William F. Wiley, late captain Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Julia C. Bradley, widow of David B. Bradley, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Matilda Weger, widow of John W. Weger, late of Company F, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Mercy A. Martin, widow of Milton Martin, late captain Company F, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mandana C. Thorp, widow of Thomas J. Thorp, late colonel One hundred and thirtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary M. Lose, widow of Daniel Lose, late of Company G, Two hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Lulu S. Knight Bigelow, widow of Jonathan G. Bigelow, late captain, Eightieth Regiment, and Company K, Eighty-third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month, with an additional \$2 per month on account of the minor child of said Jonathan G. Bigelow until she reaches the age of 16 years, said pension to be in lieu of all pension now being paid on account of the service of this soldier.

Sarah A. Hanson, widow of George H. Hanson, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Hugh Harbinson, late of Company B, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Nellie S. Nason, widow of Nahum A. Nason, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Ruth A. Hazzard, widow of Robert C. Hazzard, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Celina C. Smith, widow of Jesse Smith, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Jacob Baker, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Herbert Wadsworth, late second lieutenant Company E, Twenty-eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joanna Swander, widow of William H. Swander, late assistant surgeon Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James Hanners, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, \$16 per month.

John Stone, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eva Helena Patten, widow of Ambrose E. Patten, late of Company E, Twenty-eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Job D. Marshall, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hiram Stevens, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Louis Badger, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Martha Nutter, former widow of George D. Trembley, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Erastus T. Bowers, late of Company G, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David McLean, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alonzo E. Martin, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edwin W. Clark, late of U. S. S. *Sabine, Ohio*, and *Passaic*, United States Navy, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Kern, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Corydon B. Lakin, late first lieutenant Company B, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Emma J. Wamaling, widow of C. Thomas Wamaling, late acting third assistant engineer, United States Navy, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Thomas E. Sharp, late of Company E, One hundred and ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Della W. Crane, widow of James M. Crane, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and former widow of Edwin R. Clark, late captain Company B, Thirtieth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Elvira Louisa Kanady, widow of Sanford B. Kanady, late of Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Lorenzo D. Emory, late of Company K, Twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alvin E. Tennant, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month.

Nephil Owen, late of Company A, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Richard H. Bellamy, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James M. Dailey, late second lieutenant Company E, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elizabeth Holt, widow of John Holt, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. On page 10, I move to strike out lines 1, 2, 3, and 4, in the following words:

The name of Edwin J. Walton, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. On page 18, I move to strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive, in the following words:

The name of Mary E. B. Bruson, formerly Blackmar, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. On page 18, I move to strike out lines 19 to 22, inclusive, in the following words:

The name of William F. Wiley, late captain Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) to authorize the printing of the proceedings in Congress and in Statuary Hall relative to the unveiling of the statue of Henry Mower Rice.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution (No. 26) providing for the printing of 1,500 copies of the journal of the fiftieth national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the year 1916, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution (No. 27) providing for the printing of 20,000 copies of the revised edition of United States bankruptcy laws, as prepared by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 5016) to authorize the reconstruction of an existing bridge across the Wabash River, at Silverwood, in the State of Indiana, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of C. Stanley Emery and others, citizens of Concord, N. H., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of Herbert E. Linscott, of South Merrimack, N. H., remonstrating against the enactment

of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of 22 citizens of Nashua, N. H., remonstrating against appropriations being made for sectarian purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a memorial of Vale Grange, No. 453, Patrons of Husbandry, of Richland, Wash., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Washington State Branch, Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, praying for the adoption of the Susan B. Anthony woman-suffrage amendment to the Constitution, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 201, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bellingham, Wash., remonstrating against any change being made in the parcel-post law, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Cumberland, Me., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHELAN presented resolutions of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Oakland district, Berkeley, Cal., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines, and also to prohibit the exportation of alcoholic liquors from the United States to Africa, which were referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

He also presented petitions of Local Branch, International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, of Oakland; of Typographical Union No. 46, of Sacramento; of Local Union, Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Oakland; and of Mailers' Local Union, No. 9, of Los Angeles, all in the State of California, praying for the passage of the so-called Burnett immigration bill, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rochester, N. Y., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Troy, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HOLLIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Hampshire, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MYERS. I present a petition of Kalispell Court, Guardians of Liberty, of Kalispell, Mont., in favor of a constitutional amendment to prohibit sectarian appropriations for educational purposes and also opposing any such appropriations in the Indian appropriation bill, which I ask may be received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will lie on the table.

Mr. MYERS. I also present a petition of residents of Whitefish, Mont., in favor of a constitutional amendment to prohibit sectarian appropriations for educational purposes and also opposing any such appropriations in the Indian appropriation bill, which I ask may be received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will lie on the table.

Mr. MYERS presented the petition of A. M. S. Kindlow, of Montana, praying for an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the Flat-head irrigation project, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of the Common Council of San Diego, Cal., praying for the establishment of a submarine naval base at San Diego, Cal., which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of South Carolina, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SAULSBURY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6442) to provide for the exchange of the present Federal building site in Newark, Del., reported it without amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 759) to provide for the removal of what is now known as the Aqueduct Bridge across the Potomac

River and for the building of a bridge in place thereof, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 334) thereon.

MARKING OF CONFEDERATE SOLDIERS' GRAVES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) to continue in effect the provisions of the act of March 9, 1906, and I ask unanimous consent for its consideration. The joint resolution has passed the House. A similar joint resolution has passed the Senate. The original act has been continued in force from year to year, and it is hoped that the work may be completed the coming year.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator reports it from the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; it was handed to me by the chairman of the committee a couple of days ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederate Army and Navy who died in northern prisons and were buried near the prisons where they died, and for other purposes," approved March 9, 1906; and continued in full force and effect for two years by joint resolution approved February 26, 1908; and for the additional period of one year by a joint resolution approved on February 25, 1910; and for the additional period of two years by a joint resolution approved December 23, 1910; and for the further additional period of two years by a joint resolution approved March 14, 1914, be, and the same is hereby, continued in full force and effect for two years from the expiration of the present continuation, March 13, 1916; and the unexpended balance of the appropriation made by said act of March 9, 1906, is continued and made applicable for expenditure during the additional period of two years herein provided for: *Provided*, That the triplicate registers provided for in the original act shall include the time and place of death of each Confederate soldier prisoner of war: *Provided further*, That the compensation of the commissioner shall be fixed by the Secretary of War.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAILWAY LAND GRANTS IN IOWA (S. DOC. NO. 404).

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 160), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the papers relating to railway land grants in Iowa, transmitted in response to Senate resolution 166, Sixty-third Congress, which was submitted by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and agreed to on August 19, 1913, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION (S. DOC. NO. 392).

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 161), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the eighteenth report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended October 11, 1915, transmitted to Congress pursuant to law by the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

FEDERAL PROBATION (S. DOC. NO. 393).

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 162), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] on March 28, 1916, entitled "Memorial in re Federal Probation Bill (S. 1092)," by Charles L. Chute, secretary New York State Probation Commission, be printed as a Senate document.

ALLOTMENT OF INDIAN LANDS (S. DOC. 394).

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 163), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] on March 23, 1916, entitled "Memorial of Creek Nation as to Withdrawal of Certain Tribal Lands from Allotment," by R. C. Allen, national attorney for Creek Nation, be printed as a Senate document.

THE MERCHANT MARINE (S. DOC. NO. 395).

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 164), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "The Farmer and the Shipping Bill," by Carl Vrooman, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, be printed as a Senate document.

FINANCING THE FARMER (S. DOC. NO. 396).

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 165), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. HARDING, on March 10, 1916, entitled "How to Finance the

Farmer—Private Enterprise, not State Aid," by Myron T. Herrick and R. Ingalls, be printed as a Senate document.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CULBERSON:

A bill (S. 5427) referring certain claims against the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TAGGART:

A bill (S. 5428) granting a pension to E. R. Bigham; and
A bill (S. 5429) granting a pension to Susan S. Stran (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 5430) granting a pension to Frank D. Haskell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 5431) granting a pension to Francis G. Schutt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 5432) confirming a patent heretofore issued to Wapato Charley, an Indian in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 5433) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Harding; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 5434) granting an increase of pension to Albert A. Burleigh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 5435) to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the carrying of dangerous articles on passenger steamers; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 5436) granting a pension to Charlotte Goding (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 5437) to further amend the act of Congress entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," approved June 25, 1910, to extend the same to elections for United States Senators and for presidential electors, and to regulate, control, and limit campaign and other contributions and expenditures in connection with such elections, and to define corrupt practices in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 5438) for the relief of Nels A. Levang; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MYERS (for Mr. FLETCHER):

A bill (S. 5439) for the relief of the Southern States Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 5440) to reduce night work in post offices; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) to permit the issuance of medical and other supplies to the American National Red Cross for a temporary period; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 5379) validating certain homestead entries, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have an article prepared by B. F. Long, of North Carolina, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EPITOME FROM A CHAPTER ON THE FOURTH CIRCUIT.

[By B. F. Long, of North Carolina.]

"There is nothing so powerful as truth, and often nothing so strange."

Statement in regard to the acts of Congress relating to the Supreme Court, the precedents of Presidents in appointments thereto, the ages of judges when appointed, length of service after 70 years old,

and a comparison of the fourth circuit and the three adjacent circuits, to wit, the third, the fifth, and sixth.

The Judicial Code, section 116, creates nine judicial circuits and provides—section 119—for an allotment by the Supreme Court of its members, one each, to a circuit, among the nine circuits; it provides—section 215—that the Supreme Court of the United States shall consist of a Chief Justice and eight associates Justices, or nine judges, corresponding in number to the number of circuits. Although there is no mandatory provision requiring each circuit to have at all times a member of the Supreme Court appointed from the residents within its boundaries, such, nevertheless, is contemplated by the statutory allotment and assignments, and is really the spirit of the laws, for all the circuits are of equal dignity, vested with equal rights and power, and subject to the same duties, obligations, and regulations. It is therefore clear, upon the broad and just grounds of equality and equity, that one circuit shall not have two judges while a sister circuit has none.

We do not discuss the reasons, but we nevertheless state facts which are of deep concern, relative to the exclusion since 1864—51 years—of the fourth circuit (Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina) from a seat on the Supreme Bench. Exclusion for 51 years, since the death of Taney, challenges attention and arouses inquiry. It is fair to look further and observe what has been done in these 51 years in States and circuits contiguous to the fourth on the north, south, and west of it.

During these 51 years the third circuit, adjoining the fourth on the north, has had the following members of the court:

1. William Strong, 1870-1880.
2. J. P. Bradley, 1870-1892.
3. George Shiras, 1892.
4. Justice Pitney.

During the same time the fifth circuit, on the south, has had:

1. W. B. Wood, 1880-1887.
2. L. Q. C. Lamar, 1888-1893.
3. Justice and Chief Justice White, 1894.
4. Justice Joseph Lamar.

During the same 51 years the sixth circuit, adjoining on the west, has had:

1. Chief Justice Chase, 1864-1873.
2. Chief Justice Waite, 1874-1888.
3. Edwin M. Stanton, 1869 (but did not qualify).
4. Justice Swayne, appointed in 1862, but served 17 years after 1864.
5. John Marshall Harlan, 1877.
6. Stanley Matthews, 1881-1889.
7. H. B. Brown, 1890.
8. Howell Jackson, 1893.
9. Justice Day.
10. Justice Lurton.
11. Justice McReynolds.

So it is a fact that the three adjacent circuits to the fourth have had these 19 recognitions, two full benches plus one, since the fourth has had a member.

Comparisons usually are odious, but this one is not made with such motive. It is stated only to bring to light a condition which we believe has not been called to the attention of the Executive.

If the 10 Senators of the fourth circuit, heretofore representing 9,000,000 people, had presented this status of affairs to the Executive it may be that the fourth circuit would have been restored to her rightful place amongst the sisterhood of circuits. This state of affairs evidently has been overlooked. But it is said that the 11 appointments in the sixth can be explained from the fact that so many Presidents have come from that circuit. If that is true, and a proper precedent, then the fact that the present Executive was born and reared in the fourth circuit makes it peculiarly proper for him at the proper time to restore the equilibrium. The opportunity may not come again in another half century. But, apart from this consideration, upon all the incontrovertible facts above set forth it is respectfully urged that the fourth circuit is entitled, agreeably to the manifest intention of the laws, to have a place of equality with her sister circuits.

With regard to the five States composing the fourth circuit, it may be of interest to refer to their relations to the Department of Justice before the war, when they did have recognition. In those early days Virginia was recognized on the Supreme Bench in the persons of:

1. John Blair, 1789-1795.
2. Bushrod Washington, 1798-1829.
3. P. P. Barbour, 1836-1841.
4. John Marshall, 1801-1835.
5. Peter V. Daniels, 1841-1860.

Representing a total service of 95 years. Virginia also had Attorneys General Randolph, Lee, Wirt, and Mason.

1. Thomas Johnson, 1791-1793.
2. Samuel Chase, 1796-1811.
3. Gabriel Duval, 1811-1836.
4. Roger B. Taney, 1836-1864.

Representing a total service of 70 years; and as Attorneys General she had Smith, Pinkney, Taney, Nelson, Johnson, and lately Bonaparte.

South Carolina had Rutledge appointed but not confirmed, and William Johnson appointed in 1804 and served till 1834—30 years. As Attorney General she had one, Hugh S. Lagare.

1. James Iredell, 1790-1799.
2. Alfred Moore, 1799-1804.

Representing a service of 13 years only, more than seven times less time of representation than Virginia, more than five times less than Maryland, and more than twice less than South Carolina.

It is singular that North Carolina, largely the most populous of all the States in the fourth circuit and always having had lawyers and judges of eminence among her citizens, should never have had an Attorney General in the Cabinet. Indeed, it will be seen that Virginia has been represented in the Cabinet before the war 22 times, Maryland 18, South Carolina 6, and North Carolina only 4.

Coke has said it required the lubrications of 20 years to make a perfect lawyer. It has also been said it requires the attrition of 20 years to make the perfect judge. If these opinions as to the time required to effect proficiency are sound, the thoroughly equipped judge is found at about the age of 61. The opinions of great lawyers are at variance with Oserism. And so, too, is the sentiment of Homer, the greatest poet of all time, for he speaks of "a green old age, unconscious of decay that proves the hero born in better days."

But the idea has been advanced that as section 260 of the code provides the judge may resign at 70, after 10 years' service, and get full

pay, that he should be barred from appointment if he is 60 or slightly over at appointment. This is a non sequitur. This has not been the custom.

There is nothing in the law compelling retirement at 70, nor providing pay unless there is a service of 10 years, nor arbitrarily or otherwise barring appointment at a certain age, nor is there a limitation restricting the discretion of the appointing power.

There is the express provision favorable to age and service at 70, and there is also an express provision which shows respect for age—section 216 of the code—which says:

"The Associate Justices shall have precedence according to the dates of their commissions or, when the commissions of two or more of them bear the same date, according to their ages."

These are all the statutory rules relating to the age of the judge.

The precedents for a century or more, established under the laws of Congress, in appointing lawyers of mature experience and age to the Supreme Bench, are in direct conflict with the notion that he should be ineligible when on the shady side of 60. Indeed, such a hard and fast rule, if followed, would bar many from Congress and from the Presidency as well. Some men are stronger at 60 than others at 40. Each particular case heretofore has been determined upon its merits. Taney was appointed at 59 and served 28½ years. Waite was appointed at 58 and served 14 years. Moore was appointed when quite young, but ill health compelled his resignation in four years.

The appointments heretofore made establish the precedents and rules of action by the Executive at variance to modern suggestions that a man should be effaced at or near 60. This contention is proven by reference to a few appointments.

The 22 appointments set forth below constitute about one-third of all the judges who served on the Supreme Bench from the foundation of that court. Dates are given as of nearest birthday:

1. Judge Lurton, appointed at 65 or 66.
2. Ward Hunt, appointed at 63 (served over 10 years).
3. L. Q. C. Lamar, appointed at 63.
4. William Strong, appointed at 62.
5. Samuel Blatchford, appointed at 62 (served over 11 years).
6. Howell Jackson, appointed at 61.
7. Justice Holmes, appointed at 61.
8. Justice Shiras, appointed at 60.
9. Chief Justice Taney, appointed at 59 (served 28½ years).
10. Thomas Johnson, appointed at 59.
11. Gabriel Duval, appointed at 59.
12. J. P. Bradley, appointed at 58 (served 22 years).
13. Chief Justice Waite, appointed at 58 (served 14 years).
14. Chief Justice Chase, appointed at 57.
15. John Blair, appointed at 57.
16. John McKinley, appointed at 57.
17. Peter V. Daniels, appointed at 57.
18. W. B. Woods, appointed at 57.
19. Stanley Matthews, appointed at 57.
20. Justice Peckham, appointed at 57.
21. Chief Justice Fuller, appointed at 56.
22. Levi Woodbury, appointed at 56.

It is a remarkable fact that 36 of the 56, the total of the predecessors of the present Chief Justice on the Supreme Bench, served periods ranging in time from 10 to 34 years, though mature in age at the date of their respective appointments. The record is a wonderful one, demonstrating the large majority to have been men sound in body and mind and capable of exacting and exalted service, virile exemplars of former days.

An examination of the record also discloses the remarkable fact that 20 of the judges of the Supreme Court—nearly one-third of all who ever served after appointment—served long periods, varying in time, after they reached 70, besides the long service before 70.

In verification of the statement their ages and names and the length of service after 70, is given as follows:

1. Chief Justice Taney served after 70 years old 17½ years.
2. Duval served after 70 years old 12½ years.
3. Wayne served after 70 years old 10½ years.
4. Field served after 70 years old 10 years.
5. Marshall served after 70 years old 9½ years.
6. Nelson served after 70 years old 9½ years.
7. Catron served after 70 years old 9 years.
8. Bradley served after 70 years old 8½ years.
9. Cushing served after 70 years old 8½ years.
10. Harlan served after 70 years old 8½ years.
11. Clifford served after 70 years old 7 years.
12. Smith Thompson served after 70 years old 6½ years.
13. McLean served after 70 years old 6 years.
14. Daniels served after 70 years old 6 years.
15. Swayne served after 70 years old 6 years.
16. Grier served after 70 years old 5½ years.
17. Gray served after 70 years old 4½ years.
18. Miller served after 70 years old 4 years.
19. Blackford served after 70 years old 3½ years.
20. Waite served after 70 years old 1½ years.

LONGEVITY ON THE BENCH AND AT THE BAR.

The completion by Lord Halsbury, on September 3, of his ninetieth year reminds one of many remarkable cases of longevity both on the bench and at the bar. The illustrious Sergt. Sir John Maynard was at his death in his eighty-ninth year, having been within a few months of his death Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal. The Right Hon. James Fitzgerald, the Prime Sergeant of Ireland, died in 1834, in his ninety-fourth year, after a great career at the bar in Ireland and in the Irish and English Houses of Parliament, being required with the offer of a peerage, which was, however, declined. Mr. Robert Holmes died in 1859, in his ninety-fourth year, as father of the Irish bar, of which he was an acknowledged leader although a stuffy gownsman, having refused the highest promotion and the office of solicitor general. Lord Plunket, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, died in 1854 in his ninetieth year; Lord Lyndhurst at his death in 1864 was 90; Lord Brougham at his death in 1869 had all but completed his ninetieth year; and Lord St. Leonards at his death in 1875 was 94. The Right Hon. Thomas Lefroy, Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, who presided over the Irish Court of Queen's Bench in 1866 when he was past 90, died in 1869 in his ninety-third year. Vice Chancellor Bacon, who died in 1895 in his ninety-seventh year, continued to discharge the duties of vice chancellor till 1886. In Canada, Sir James Robert Gowan, who died in 1910 in his ninety-sixth year, had the unique record of 60 years of judicial work. (Law Notes, Nov. 15, 1915.)

These are a few who grew old—not in years but in deeds, service, and honor.

We have illustrious examples in the different States where eminent judges, cotemporaries of some of the justices mentioned above, served on the bench long after they had reached three score and ten. Two of these may be mentioned because they made State, National, and international reputations—Chief Justice Richmond M. Pearson and Chief Justice Thomas Ruffin. Pearson was unsurpassed in America as a common-law lawyer and judge. Ruffin was a familiar acquaintance of Marshall and Kent, and by them and such as they was esteemed one of the ablest judges in all branches of the law who ever presided over courts among English-speaking people. It may be added that no lawyer, perhaps, in America ever rendered more efficient and lasting service to his country than John B. Minor, professor of common and statute law of the University of Virginia, who died in the harness when he had passed his four score years.

The Supreme Court of the United States is the only court from whose judgments there is no appeal. "None but the judgments of the Lord are just and righteous altogether." Nevertheless in the government of men the power must be lodged somewhere for final arbitration, and where mankind hope justice and righteousness may be established. This transcendent power is given the Supreme Court. This Supreme Court magnifies the importance of its decrees and that these guardians of the Constitution, the life, liberty, and perpetuity of the Union shall be ripe in wisdom and virtue and mature in years and experience.

This statement is made to present a few obscured or forgotten truths. The best way to arrive at the truth is to examine things as they actually have been, now are, and not as they are imagined or fancied to be either by ourselves or others. From what has heretofore been stated, it logically follows when two of the circuits each have two members of the court that two others are denied membership, and this inevitably results in inequality. This has not always been so as to any one of the nine, except as to the fourth for the last half century. History will associate the discrimination with the penalties of the Civil War. The appointing power of the present can view the past with poise and calmness and recall Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina were four of the original 13, whose first succession established this great Republic; and although three of them joined the second secession they paid the debt in full of the vanquished, without murmur, and without dishonor, and became again more powerful constituents of a restored Union. The immediate precedents of exclusion were set at the close of the war, and unhappily acquiesced in since, but the time has come when the sunshine of fraternity and equality should break through and dispel the long-continued eclipse. The Most High visited upon his chosen people a sentence of wandering in the wilderness of only 40—not 51 years.

The sole purpose of this simple statement will be effected if in anywise the appointing power is aided in an examination of the facts, to the end that equality and justice shall be reestablished between circuits and States of equal dignity and power and entitled to equal rights under the laws.

Although, since the end of reconstruction, these five States—practically one-ninth of the Republic—have been accorded the untrammelled right to vote in presidential elections, and to have representation in Congress, their sole dependence and hope for equitable representation in the other—the judicial department—has been in the appointing power.

Is it not one of the most notable occurrences in our history that this great people throughout their humiliation of a half century have borne it patiently and without uttering a word of complaint or criticism?

Since there is no virtue so great and godlike as justice, does not this extraordinary situation appeal to the head and heart of a thoughtful President, capable of "hearing courteously, considering soberly, answering wisely, and deciding impartially?"

ARMY DENTAL CORPS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I present a letter from William C. Crenshaw, of Atlanta, Ga., president of the National Association of Dental College Faculties, addressed to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. LEE S. OVERMAN,

ATLANTA, GA., March 23, 1916.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: You were a member of the Senate Military Committee and actively interested in several Army Dental Corps bills which were considered and reported by the committee and passed by the Senate, each of which bills provided that the three grades of rank of lieutenant, captain, and major should be available to the Dental Corps subject to the same periods of service required in the case of Medical, Pay, and other Staff Corps. You were particularly interested in minimizing the discrimination in the matter of rank and status which the Congress was influenced, through unidentified and mysterious sources, to inflict on the dental profession and its schools.

I therefore write you to again assure you of the profession's appreciation of your interest in the object stated, and also to urgently ask a continuance of your active support of an effort to so amend the dental provisions of the pending Army reorganization bill that the Dental Corps may, for the sake of its efficiency and because of the immeasurable effect of its military status on the civil status of the profession, be accorded rank and a military status commensurate with the profession's civil status and with the importance of its function in preserving and restoring the health, comfort, and efficiency of these of our fellow citizens who are called to arms in defense of the democracy of our country and of our country's claim to accord its people equal opportunity without discriminating distinctions.

The executive and the legislative branches of the Government have been in accord with the general policy of placing the several staff corps on a parity in the matter of rank and pay, so that the highly educated specialist in medicine and surgery and the specially trained officers of the Pay and other Staff Corps are on an equal footing. Experience has proven the wisdom of this policy, while digressions therefrom result in discriminating distinctions destructive of the esprit de corps essential to efficiency and economy.

The claim made but a few years ago in behalf of the Medical and other Staff Corps that equality of rank and pay should obtain between officers educated at their own expense and those educated at Government expense has not only been established as just, but has resulted in attracting to both the Army and the Navy Medical Corps a more highly educated, broadly qualified, and notably efficient class of sur-

geons. The same claim and the same reasoning would apply with equal force and similar results in the case of dental officers who treat those of our fellow citizens whose lives are offered in defense of their country. To deny the dental surgeon an equality with other officers whose function is the amelioration of human suffering and the preservation of human efficiency, and instead attempt to degrade him to the military position of the Army horse doctor, carries with it an equal degradation of the soldier to the level of the military horse.

Many of your colleagues are convinced—in fact, it is almost uniformly recognized—that the Army and Navy personnel require and have a right to expect the Government to provide the most competent general medical and special surgical service available, and it is also generally recognized that there can not be an equality in the competency of the service rendered by the several different professions represented in the Army and Navy if there is not also an equality in their social, professional, and official status.

In support of the object of the amendment, a tentative draft of which you indorsed to Senator CHAMBERLAIN on the 17th instant, I append hereto excerpts from the views of the Military Committees of the Senate and House on similar bills, which were expressed in their official reports, and also the views of many non-dental men of prominence in the educational affairs of the country, and additionally some data bearing on the high status and the extraordinary results accomplished by the Canadian Army Dental Corps, and also on the unparalleled results of the dental service in connection with the European war.

Surgery is surgery, whether practiced by a medical doctor or a doctor of dental surgery. There was never a greater contribution to the science and art of surgery nor a more blessed boon to suffering mankind everywhere, especially to the soldier wounded on the field of battle, than the discovery and application by dental surgeons of surgical anesthesia.

I will probably send Senator SMITH a copy of the above referred to collection of data on the subject and ask him to have it printed and made available to other Senators who are interested in the attainment of this almost universally approved object.

With a deep sense of gratitude to you personally and in behalf of my profession, I remain,

Yours, very sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRENSHAW,
President of the National Association
of Dental College Faculties.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 10384. An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY LAWS.

THE VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 27) of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 20,000 copies of the revised edition of United States bankruptcy laws, as prepared by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives, the said 20,000 copies to be distributed as follows: Three thousand copies to the Senate folding room, 3,000 copies for the Senate document room, 7,000 copies for the House folding room, and 7,000 copies for the House document room.

GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

THE VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 26) of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the Journal of the fiftieth national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the year 1916, not to exceed \$1,700 in cost, with illustrations, 1,000 copies of which shall be for the use of the House and 500 for the use of the Senate.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask leave, out of order, at this time to introduce an amendment to the so-called military bill. I am introducing the amendment now in order that it may be printed for the consideration of Senators.

Briefly stated, the amendment provides pay for militia officers above the rank of captain who are engaged in active service.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a number of telegrams bearing upon the subject matter of the amendment.

The military bill, as it is drawn, deprives all officers above the rank of captains serving with their companies of pay. The alleged basis for that action is that officers above the rank of captain do no work of importance. It is claimed that they do not give their time and labor to the upbuilding of the National Guard.

In order to ascertain whether the allegations referred to were founded in fact or otherwise, I sent two forms of telegrams to various officers of the National Guard which I ask leave to insert in the RECORD. One of these forms was sent to captains commanding companies. The other form was sent to officers above the rank of captain. I employed the two forms and caused them respectively to be sent to the classes of officers referred to for this reason: Those sent to captains commanding companies would elicit answers from men who will, under the terms of the bill, receive pay. The amendment does not in any manner affect their pay, therefore, their opinions and statements of fact are in no manner colored by interest. The other telegram sent to officers who will be affected by the amendment I

propose affords them an opportunity to frankly state their views, and the facts relative to the character of service by them rendered.

I ask leave to insert in the RECORD: First, a copy of the telegram sent by me to officers above the rank of captain together with the answers by me received thereto. Second, a copy of the telegram sent by me to the captains commanding companies together with the answers I received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. The copy of the telegram sent by me to officers above the rank of captain is as follows:

[Telegram.]

APRIL 9, 1916.

In justification of Senate bill which fails to provide pay for other than company officers, it is claimed that staff officers do not devote any considerable portion of their time to military work. How much of your time and money do you annually devote to the National Guard? Wire immediately.

JAMES A. REED.

The replies received from officers above the rank of captain are as follows:

NEVADA, Mo., April 10, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Commanding general is responsible for instruction, discipline, government, equipment, condition, movement, and operations of National Guard, requiring his constant supervision and attention, devoting very large part of his time, as he must pass upon everything. Colonels are responsible for instruction and discipline of their regiments, keeping up strength and interest, visiting companies, handling correspondence, and countless matters requiring fully half their time in city regiments. Majors are required to supervise drill of their battalions, giving four nights each week in country regiments; majors visit towns in which companies are stationed, supervising same. Brigade and regimental adjutants, quartermasters, and inspectors of rifle practice handle all work and correspondence of their departments, giving fully half their time in addition to other duties. All officers above named devote much time to study schools and correspondence schools to keep abreast of progress in military matters.

Duties of company commander require much time, and pay should be at least as much as that provided in the Senate bill, but lieutenants are given proportionately too much, as they give relatively much less than any other officer in this Guard; and as between captains and lieutenants the relative pay fixed in Hay bill is much more equitable than in Senate bill. In National Guard of this State amount of time devoted to military duties is, generally speaking, in direct ratio to rank of the officer, and in strict fairness pay should be proportional to rank, as it is with enlisted men in this bill, and with officers in the Army. However, we regard the provisions of the Hay bill, fixing the pay of all officers above the grade of captain at the same sum fixed for that grade as based upon the principle that the higher officers are willing to make greater sacrifice of their time, and we therefore earnestly indorse the rates of pay fixed in section 76 of the Hay bill. We call attention to the fact that section 112 of the Senate bill provides that only officers paid under section 108 shall be called in case of war. If these two sections stand no officer above the rank of captain would be eligible to Federal service in war. We are in the National Guard to serve the United States.

HARVEY C. CLARK,
Brigadier General Commanding.
A. B. DONNELLY,
Colonel First Regiment.
W. A. RAUPP,
Colonel Second Regiment.
F. A. LAMB,
Colonel Third Regiment.
J. D. MCNEELY,
Colonel Fourth Regiment.
E. M. STAYTON,
Major Battalion Field Artillery.

ST. JOSEPH, Mo., April 9, 1916.

JAMES A. REED,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Relative to representation that colonels, and so forth, of militia do not devote any considerable time to it, will state that between 400 and 500 communications pertaining to militia originate in or are forwarded, transmitted, or received in my office each month, including militia orders, letters, reports, returns, vouchers, applications, and so forth. My telephone toll bill on military business the past month was \$25. Two-thirds of my time is devoted to my regiment and I make a living with the other third. Two-thirds of the work of my law-office stenographer is military work; one-half of my office suite is devoted to military work. About 30 different forms of printed military blanks are required to be used. Am willing to bring to Washington, without Government expense, a couple of trunks full of military files of my office to substantiate above, asking only in return that if enemies of the National Guard are found to have misrepresented on this point their statements on all others be regarded with suspicion. If any Senator who opposes Federal support to brigade, regimental, and battalion commanders will personally visit any near-by regimental headquarters of Washington or Baltimore National Guard and go through the files, he will be surprised at the extent of work involved and will turn against those upon whom he has heretofore relied for information. Gen. Clark devotes two-thirds of his time to military work, notwithstanding he is a prominent lawyer. My majors devote considerable time to work of instruction, organization, and inspection. My adjutant devotes two or three hours a day to military work. For any further information wire me. Am ready to back all statements with proof.

JOHN D. MCNEELY,
Colonel Fourth Missouri Infantry.

ST. JOSEPH, Mo., April 9, 1916.

JAMES A. REED,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Relative to Senate bill refusing recognition to officers above rank of captain, permit me to state that our brigade commander, Gen. Clark, was lieutenant colonel of Volunteers in Spanish War. Long prior to that was company commander, and previously an enlisted man. I am an honor graduate of Missouri State Military School, where I was a cadet five years. Served as officer in this regiment in Volunteers, 1898-99. Have attained rank by gradual promotion. Lieutenant colonel and majors of regiment have been officers for from 14 to 25 years and earned promotion by service. I submit that it would be utterly discouraging to them if Congress declares promotion earned by faithful service deprived them of recognition under the bill.

JOHN D. MCNEELY,
Colonel Fourth Missouri Infantry.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Statement that field and staff officers devote but little time to guard absolutely untrue and ridiculous on its face. As colonel of the First Infantry I average five nights a week and every spare moment I can get away from my business. Majors and staff officers I require to be present three nights, besides calling on them occasionally in the daytime. Thursday of each week these officers are required to be at the armory from 6 to 11.30 p. m. Is the Senate willing to believe any business, or the Government itself, could be conducted successfully if the head of it or the executive department gave it but little time? The colonel and his staff occupy relatively the same position to a regiment as the President and his Cabinet do to the Government. Furthermore, I might have a company captain and fine soldier and deserving of promotion to major, or especially fitted for the staff. If his means were limited, he could not give up pay of company officer and assume expense as major without pay.

ARTHUR P. DONNELLY,
Colonel First Infantry.

KIRKSVILLE, Mo., April 9, 1916.

JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

I spend many days in inspecting scattered companies and keeping them up to standard. I have been a captain for years, and I find that a major spends more time out of the city. His work is more difficult than that of a captain. He, too, should receive pay.

J. E. REGOR, Major.

TRENTON, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Have been an officer in the National Guard since 1902. Service continuous; company commander greater portion of that time; have made probably 10 or more trips inspecting and instructing companies; not in home town in the past year.

W. D. STEPP,
Major, Fourth Infantry, National Guard.

The copy of telegrams sent by me to captains of companies is as follows:

[Telegram.]

APRIL 9, 1916.

In justification of Senate bill, which fails to provide pay for other than company officers, it is claimed generals, colonels, majors, and staff officers do not in fact devote any considerable portion of their time to military work. Wire facts. Also have captains commanding companies wire statements of amount of work done by generals, colonels, majors, and staff officers. Must have answers immediately.

JAMES A. REED.

The replies received from captains commanding companies are as follows:

ST. LOUIS, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Information received here to the effect that claims are made in Washington that generals, colonels, majors, and staff officers devote but little time to National Guard service. At a meeting of company commanders of the First Infantry, National Guard of Missouri, this evening the undersigned decided to protest the attempt to exclude above officers from pay. Desire to state that all these officers devote at least three nights a week, and often more. The organization could not exist if they are discriminated against. In fact, the higher the rank the greater the amount of time devoted to the service. This applies from general to second lieutenant.

George V. Stewart, Captain Company A; R. W. Rombauer, Captain Company B; A. R. Sourwein, Captain Company C; Gunther Meier, Captain Company D; G. M. Faught, Captain Company E; E. F. Lloyd, Company F; J. R. Robinson, Captain Company G; E. J. McMahon, Captain Company H; J. F. Carmack, Captain Company I; Fred Bottger, Captain Company K; John Schweitzer, Captain Company L; J. J. Koch, Captain Company M; N. B. Comfort, Captain Machine Gun Company.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly indorse the rates of pay fixed in the Hay bill. The higher the officer the more time he is required to give the service. This applies to every officer in the National Guard.

Capt. F. G. Ward; Capt. W. E. Coe; Capt. John Constable; Capt. W. B. Johnson; Capt. C. F. Jones; Capt. T. C. Ross; Capt. W. A. Smith; Capt. F. W. Hardin; Capt. A. Barnes; Capt. G. E. Sanstrom; Capt. W. Osgood; Capt. A. Johnson.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Colonel devotes practically all his evenings to guards; majors and staff officers' presence required three nights a week. Senate bill provides promotion must be made from guard. No company officer who was being reimbursed for time and expense could afford assume additional expense of colonel, major, and staff officer and at the same time sacrifice the small amount the Government gave him as company officer. As a result would be impossible to fill vacancies in higher rank, or else have inefficiency on account of their wealth. We would have a lot of companies with no directing head.

N. B. COMFORT,
Captain Machine Gun Company.

St. Louis, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you offer amendment to include all officers in pay provision of Senate bill. Strength of a regiment lies in its colonel, majors, and staff officers, as well as company officers. They are compelled to spend as much time as anyone—never less than three nights a week.

J. J. KOCH,
Captain Company M.

St. Louis, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Bill should include field and staff officers in pay. Absolutely necessary or legislation will be a failure. If present officers should resign, no company officer would accept additional expense and worry of field officer, thereby losing pay as company officer.

JOHN SCHWEITZER,
Captain Company L.

Trenton, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Officers of higher rank have more responsibility, and much is required of them, having attained their rank by reason of having served in the various lower grades. Their continued services is, in my judgment, very necessary.

W. C. WILLIAMSON,
Captain, Fourth Infantry, National Guard of Missouri.

St. Louis, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

The higher the rank of officer in National Guard, more time, expense, and responsibility. Organization would fall if they neglected their business.

G. M. FAUGHT,
Captain Company E.

St. Louis, Mo., April 8, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

If your statement of time devoted by field and staff officers were correct, there would be 10 regimental organization, but 12 little organizations instead of 1 homogeneous whole.

J. R. ROBINSON,
Captain Company G.

St. Louis, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

The colonel has to devote more time; majors and staff officers same time as company officers; their expense is also great.

E. J. McMAHON,
Captain Company H.

St. Louis, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Successful administration of a regiment requires more time of colonel and major and staff officers than anyone. I personally declined a major's commission on account of time and expense.

A. R. SOURWEIN,
Captain Company C.

St. Louis, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Our colonel devotes more time to regiment than any man in service; staff officers and majors same time as company commanders.

R. W. ROMBAUER,
Captain Company B.

St. Louis, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

No truth in statement about field and staff officers; the passage of bill failing to provide pay for these officers would result in this organization weaken the bill immeasurably.

J. F. CARMACK,
Captain Company I.

St. Louis, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Regiment could not exist if colonel and staff failed to give time and attention.

GEO. W. STEWART,
Captain Company A.

St. Louis, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Colonel, majors, staff officers devote fully as much time as company officers. Failure to provide pay unjust, and would operate to prevent any captain accepting promotion or serving on staff.

GUNTHER MEIER,
Captain Company D.

St. Louis, Mo., April 9, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

Colonel devotes practically all his evenings and large part of days to guard; majors and staff officers compelled to stand same time as company officers. Hope bill is amended to include them in pay.

FRED BOTTOER,
Captain Company K.

St. Joseph, Mo., April 9, 1916.

JAMES A. REED,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Colonel of regiment, being highest rank, does more work than company commander. Paper work of company multiplied in his office by 12 or 14, same being number of subordinate organizations dealt with by colonel and adjutant.

CHAS. E. HOLT,
Captain Company M, Fourth Missouri.
W. A. MANN,
Captain and Adjutant, Fourth Missouri.

Pierce City, Mo., April 10, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. REED,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The higher the rank the more time given the service. This applies to every officer from brigadier general to second lieutenant. We earnestly indorse rate of pay fixed in Hay bill.

Elmer Throwbridge, Captain Company A, Second Infantry, National Guard Missouri; Ed. C. Clarke, Captain Company B, Second Infantry, National Guard Missouri; Joseph H. Hull, Captain Company C, Second Infantry, National Guard Missouri; Fred A. Nesbit, Captain Company D, Second Infantry, National Guard Missouri; S. A. Martin, Captain Company E, Second Infantry, National Guard Missouri; H. A. Hibler, Captain Company F, Second Infantry, National Guard Missouri; S. A. Fillingham, Captain Company G, Second Infantry, National Guard Missouri; Fred A. Nesbit, Captain Company I, Second Infantry, National Guard Missouri; Paul A. Frey, Captain Company K, Second Infantry, National Guard Missouri; Wm. S. Moon, Captain Company L, Second Infantry, National Guard Missouri; Wm. A. Oglesby, Captain Company M, Second Infantry, National Guard Missouri; W. M. Williams, Captain Machine Gun Company.

DUTY ON SUGAR.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think, Mr. President, we are now in position to resume the consideration of the sugar bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 11471) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I had intended addressing the Senate at some length upon the substitute reported by the Committee on Finance of the Senate to the House bill repealing the free-sugar clause of the Underwood tariff bill. I quite realize, as we all do here, that the main controversy with regard to this matter will most probably take place as the result of the conference between the two Houses upon their disagreement. I can not, however, permit the bill to come to a vote without at least expressing myself with regard to the substitute reported by the committee, because of the great interest which Louisiana has as the result of this legislation.

These are unusual times and on every hand the question of preparing this country for defense because of the conditions existing in Europe has focused the public mind upon what preparedness really contemplates. Of course, we all understand that preparedness has for its primary purpose the organization upon some systematic and scientific plan of the various arms of defense used during times of war. But conditions in Europe have shown us that that alone will not suffice to have this country thoroughly prepared for its defense. So we see in some quarters that efforts are being made to prepare the commercial conditions of the country against the result of the European war after it shall have terminated.

Suggestions have come to Congress, through various sources, as to the necessity of various preparations and for the enactment of some laws to save the industries of this country from the dumping on the American market of a large quantity of goods cheaply produced after the close of the war in Europe. Other suggestions have come to us in the shape, for instance, of the suggestion that there should be a protective tariff upon dyestuffs, in order that we may not be entirely dependent upon Germany for those commodities essential to the manufacture of the clothing of the people of this country. Various other suggestions have been made; for instance, such as the construction of a plant or plants in order to produce the nitrates of this

country. All of these suggestions have grown out of conditions that have made the necessity for them apparent, as the result of the war in Europe. I take it, that sugar comes in the category of things as to which we ought to prepare as the result of conditions that we find existing in the two largest sugar-consuming countries now engaged in the war.

Let us note, for instance, the conditions of Germany. Germany, which heretofore has produced more sugar than was necessary for her own consumption, was enabled, because of that surplus production, to build up a large trade with England by disposing of her surplus sugar upon that market, which enabled her to purchase goods from England for the use of the German people. Germany to-day, though practically closed from outside traffic, and certainly unable to get any sugar from anywhere else, finds herself enabled to furnish her people with the sugar requisite for their everyday consumption. We find that the price of sugar in Germany, because of the policy pursued by Germany, has not yet reached 5 cents a pound. England, which heretofore had purchased sugar so very cheaply of Germany, because of the overproduction of sugar in that country, found herself at the outset of the war closed from a market that had theretofore supplied her with sugar, and found herself under the necessity of approaching our supply market in order to secure the necessary quantity of sugar to supply her people.

What has been the result? The result is that sugar is selling in England to-day at 9 cents a pound, as compared with less than 5 cents in Germany, simply because, on the one hand, Germany was prepared to meet those conditions and England was totally unprepared. The policy which this bill suggests, if carried out by this Government, must inevitably place us in the same situation should we at some subsequent time become involved in a great contest—which I hope will never occur—and will place us in the identical position in which we find England to-day. If we have not prepared ourselves to produce either from a domestic source or through our insular possessions sufficient sugar to supply the American people, we shall find ourselves in the same attitude in which we find the British people to-day. Not only will we have to pay double or thrice the normal price of sugar, but we shall be compelled, in order to enable us to secure the quantity of sugar requisite to supply the American people, to submit ourselves to other difficulties. For instance, over and above the enhanced value of sugar to the British people, because of the war in Europe, we find that within the first year and a half of the contest, while the British people were compelled to pay over \$125,000,000 in excess of what they had been paying for the same quantity of sugar in the year and a half preceding that time, in order to get this sugar, she was compelled to encroach upon our source of supply; and the American people, taking no part at all in the war, have found themselves contributing on that one item alone over \$175,000,000 because of the advanced price of sugar, through the competition of the British people with us upon the market from which we draw our supply.

I am calling attention to these facts, because the policy which this bill as amended by the Senate Finance Committee would place upon the domestic production must of necessity stop the development of that industry and must of necessity place us in the same condition in which England was in August, 1914, when the great war broke out.

But, Mr. President, looking at the report of the committee with regard to this legislation, I find this statement:

In making this recommendation your committee regrets that owing to the abnormal conditions, both as respects the revenues and expenditures of the Government, on account of the European war and legislation made necessary by it, the revenue requirements make it inexpedient at this time to dispense with the revenues which will accrue to the Treasury from the temporary continuance of existing duties upon sugar and the other articles of the sugar schedule hereinbefore enumerated.

The committee states that it regrets that it is at this time compelled to permit the continuance of the existing duty for a period of four years. I feel indeed sorry, Mr. President—and I know that the regret which I express at the attitude of the party to which I belong is shared by the people whom I represent, who also lend their allegiance to the Democratic Party—I regret indeed that the party does not find itself able to afford more opportunity, more consolation, as the result of this legislation, than is contemplated by this report and by the utterances of Senators on this side of the Chamber.

We have looked at the sugar situation from many viewpoints; we have had our trials and tribulations in regard to it for the last four years. The industry has been in a condition tottering upon the verge of absolute bankruptcy. Many of those engaged in it in the last few years have gone into bankruptcy; many others have survived by extraordinary efforts to maintain themselves until the prices were enhanced as the result of the war

going on in Europe. We had hoped that when this step was taken it would define the attitude of the Democratic Party on this question, and that that attitude would be one affording some opportunity for those in Louisiana engaged in the industry to continue it without having, as they have had for the last three years, the threat of the annihilation of that industry hanging over them. Of course, under this policy, while this tariff will help them during the period of four years in contemplation by this bill, if that is the final action of Congress; yet we must know that, as a result of that policy, there can be no advancement in the development of the industry and that no additional money can possibly be invested in an industry the life of which is fixed by statute and the life of which can not be extended beyond the limitation fixed in the statute.

So, I say, I regret that the people of Louisiana can find so little consolation at this time when the party declares that its purpose to continue the present duty for a period of four years is not dependent upon whether it may accrue to their interest or not; it is not dependent upon whether they are to receive that sort of encouragement at the hands of the party to which they belong; but it depends solely and entirely upon the condition of the Treasury; that their condition is not to be consulted, but solely and exclusively the condition of the Treasury is to be consulted in legislating with regard to that industry. This is a keen disappointment to me, as a Democrat. It will prove a keen disappointment to the Democrats of Louisiana.

I do not want to make it appear that the people engaged in the production of sugar in Louisiana want to be discriminated in favor of by any legislation by Congress. All they ask is to be treated upon an impartial equality with other people engaged in other industries throughout the country. They are not asking at the hands of Congress, they are not asking at the hands of the Democratic membership of the other House or of this that they be selected with a view of being favored, but they do insist upon the declaration of the platform of their party; they do insist that they shall have that same equal and fair treatment that other industries in the country are receiving and are admitted to be receiving under the same bill which we seek to amend here. That that industry should be selected from the other industries of the country, that it should be ordered when not needed, to stand aside or to come forward and deliver whenever the Treasury is without funds, and that it should be turned out of doors whenever the Treasury has sufficient money to administer the Government is not Democratic, and it does not appeal to the sense of fairness and justice of any man; yet that is the attitude in which that industry is placed. The people of Louisiana are told, in substance, as in so many words, "Whenever the Treasury requires you to contribute toward the maintenance of the Government, you can come forward and deliver your share of the taxes to conduct the Government, but whenever we can raise such taxes in some other way then you must stand out and be extinguished, because there is no need for your services." I do not believe that that attitude could be sustained before the American people if that issue were permitted to be presented to them, because their sense of fairness, their sense of justice, would not permit that attitude to be held very long on this floor or elsewhere.

Mr. President, what has been the attitude of the party to which I belong, with regard to this matter, since it has come into power? Just prior to the presidential election the House of Representatives passed a bill putting this article on the free list. When the convention was held at Baltimore that proposition was pending before the Finance Committee of the Senate. After the platform had been written and the candidate of the party had been selected the Senate Committee on Finance reported upon the free-sugar bill which had been passed by the other House and reported as a substitute for the House free-sugar proposition a bill carrying practically the same duty as exists to-day.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I do not wish to disturb the Senator, but I want to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I yield for a question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will not the Senator admit that the Baltimore platform contains specific approval of the tariff-schedule bills passed by the House of Representatives?

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; I will not admit that, Mr. President, nor will I discuss that proposition. I had intended going over the entire subject matter, but I do not wish to detain the Senate.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well.

Mr. BROUSSARD. But I will not admit that, of course, nor will I discuss it at this time.

Mr. HARDWICK. Just one other question. Will the Senator put in his remarks the words of the Baltimore platform on that point?

Mr. BROUSSARD. The words of the Baltimore platform?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; on the tariff-schedule bills passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The Senator and I have thrashed that out time and time again, and I could no more convince him than he could convince me. The difference between the Senator and myself is that I was one of those who drafted the platform and the Senator was not. So we can not convince one another.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not want to bother the Senator, but I only have the knowledge that Democrats generally have from what the committee did and what the convention adopted. I should just like to ask the Senator, so that he will not misrepresent the attitude of the party, to put in connection with his remarks, or read now to the Senate and to the country, what the platform at Baltimore said about the tariff-schedule bills of the House of Representatives, one of which was the bill providing for free sugar?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I will not do that, either. I have stated already that the Senator and I have discussed that on many occasions, and I have no hope of converting the Senator from his conclusions; and, of course, having been one of those who drafted the particular platform in question, I have absolute knowledge of what I speak. I do not intend to discuss that, but I want to present this aspect of the question to the Senate: The House having passed the free-sugar bill, the Democratic convention having been held at Baltimore, the platform having been adopted and announced and the candidate selected, the Finance Committee of the Senate reported back to the Senate and substituted for the free-sugar bill of the House a bill carrying a duty, practically the duty now in the law, and the extension of which is sought to be accomplished by both the House and the Senate bills. Subsequently the passage by the House of the Underwood bill brought to the Senate a proposition on the part of the House as a part of the Underwood bill to impose on sugar a duty of three-fourths of the then existing duty, with free sugar at the end of three years. In that proposition the Senate concurred; so that that provision is in the law.

At this session of Congress the House, finding that the Treasury needs the money, finding that the Treasury can not get along with the duty on sugar abandoned as provided in the Underwood law, continues indefinitely that duty, which is the sensible thing to do, because no one can tell just how long the Treasury will be in need of this 1 cent a pound duty on sugar; no one can tell what two or three or four years may bring, and, furthermore, everybody understands that this Congress cannot find upon that proposition a subsequent Congress which will do here four years hence.

Now, what attitude does the committee of the Senate take with regard to the last House action? The Senate committee comes back at the duty fixed by the House at 1 cent a pound, and retorts by saying that, after four years that duty of 1 cent a pound shall cease; in other words, before the assembling of the Baltimore Convention the House favored free sugar and the Senate would not abide by it, but after the convention had been held and the candidate had been elected, at this time the House says that the duty of 1 cent, which was retained in the Underwood tariff law for a period of three years, is necessary to supply the Government with the needed money for its operations; but the Senate says "we will not need it after four years"; and so we propose to legislate for whatever Congress may be sitting here four years hence, all the time holding this threat over that great industry so as to stop its development, so as to prevent an opportunity for securing credit in order to produce the quantity of sugar that could and would be produced under normal conditions in this country. So that it all leads us back to the proposition with which I started, that we are now adopting a policy similar to the policy which England has pursued; and, if, perchance, within any short period of time this country should become involved in any extensive military operations, regardless of whether we are able to reach our base of supply in Cuba, regardless of whether our Navy could insure our commercial vessels reaching the ports from which we draw our sugar, we would find that the competition in those ports would put us at the same disadvantage under which England finds herself at this moment.

If 30 or 40 years ago England had pursued the policy of developing the sugar industry in her tropical islands, and had lent some sort of encouragement to the people engaged in that industry, instead of catering to that trade next to her, which gave her cheaper sugar than could be given by the people who produced sugar on her islands—if she had pursued that policy, at this time, when it is so difficult for her to get the means

with which to conduct the great war, she would not find herself compelled to disburse great sums of money in order to supply her people with sugar. So it will be with this country. If we are made to rely absolutely upon the importation of sugar to supply the demands of this country it is inevitably going to result in this country as it resulted in England should we find ourselves engaged in war at any time.

I did not, as I said, Mr. President, intend to deal very extensively with this question, but I did want to express the regret which I feel, the regret which I know the Democrats of Louisiana feel, toward the attitude represented in this report and so often stated upon this floor, that the people of the State of Louisiana must look to a policy under which, if they continue to grow sugar, they must compete with the world without any duty at all, and, if any duty is imposed upon the article, the production of which forms the main industry of the State, it will not be because there is any concern with regard to the people of Louisiana or their investment or their methods of livelihood, but because the needs of the Treasury require that they shall contribute something toward replenishing that Treasury. I repeat, I regret this act of my party, and Democrats in Louisiana join me in expressing this regret, which we all feel in that State.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I had expected at this time to move to take up another measure, but I understand there is no objection to proceeding at once to a vote on amendments to the pending bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If we are prepared to go on and vote upon the amendments to the pending bill, I do not desire to move to proceed to the consideration of another measure; but if we are not so prepared, I wish to move to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 18, being Senate bill 706.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, as the Chair understands, on the amendment offered by the committee to strike out and insert.

Mr. LODGE. No, Mr. President; I have moved an amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stands corrected. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment I have offered is to add a new section to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Kern	Poinexter	Stone
Brandegee	La Follette	Pomeroy	Sutherland
Broussard	Lane	Ransdell	Swanson
Burleigh	Lewis	Saulsbury	Taggart
Chamberlain	Lodge	Shafer	Thomas
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Thompson
Clapp	Nelson	Sherman	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Norris	Shields	Underwood
Cole	Oliver	Simmons	Vardaman
Dillingham	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	Wadsworth
Gallinger	Owen	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Hardwick	Page	Smith, Mich.	
Hughes	Phelan	Smith, S. C.	
Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Smoot	

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who has been called to his State on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no intention or desire to discuss this amendment. Its purpose is to place duties on certain dyestuffs and coal-tar products with a view of encouraging the development of that industry here, and the production of those acids which are essential in the production of explosives, and of which we are now almost completely destitute.

I think all the Senators are familiar both with the need of these acids for the purposes of defense and with the great need of the dyestuffs caused by the scarcity due to the war in Europe; and all I desire is to have a vote upon the amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have not read carefully the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. In fact, I have not read it at all. I did not know whether the Senator would press the amendment or not. I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if this is not the bill introduced in the House by Mr. HILL, of Connecticut, and known as the Hill bill?

Mr. LODGE. It is the bill that was introduced in the House by Mr. HILL, of Connecticut.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to ask the Senator what is the average rate of duty provided by it? About 75 per cent, is it not?

Mr. LODGE. Five per cent on the first, all products of coal; 3½ cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem on the intermediates; and 7½ cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem on all colors or dyes derived from coal.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have understood that that is about an average of 75 per cent ad valorem. That bill is before the House committee, and there have been some conferences over here with some persons interested in the industry. I do not think even those interested in the industry have asked quite as much protection as the Hill bill affords; and without discussing it, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will not prevail.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I did not intend to discuss this question; but before voting on it I should like to have an opportunity to state my reasons in reference to it.

This amendment seeks, in the main, to increase the tax on what are known as coal-tar dyes. There are some other side propositions in the amendment, but that is the main question. The tax placed on coal-tar dyes in the Dingley bill amounted to 30 per cent ad valorem. Under the Dingley bill a large number of these dyes were imported into this country; but gradually an industry grew up and occupied about 10 per cent of the American field. In other words, we produced at home about 10 per cent of our coal-tar dyes. The other 90 per cent were imported from Germany. I think one reason why a larger percentage of coal-tar dyes was not manufactured in this country was because the textile manufacturers rather slighted the American production, and claimed that the American manufacturers did not make as successful dyes as the German dyes. I have serious doubts in my own mind as to whether that was the case.

When the Payne Ways and Means Committee met to write a new tariff bill after the Dingley rate had been on the statute books for, I think, 14 years, the producers of coal-tar dyes came before that committee, asking for an increase, and the Payne committee denied the increase, claiming that the 30 per cent tax was sufficient. When the last tariff bill was written, and the Democratic Ways and Means Committee was organized, the home producers of coal-tar dyes came before the Ways and Means Committee and did not ask for an increase of the tax. There was a very great demand on the part of the textile manufacturers of the country for a reduction of this tax.

The manufacturers of coal-tar dyes in this country who appeared before the committee—and they were the leading men in the business—stated that they did not ask for an increase; that they could run their business on the present tax, but that to reduce the tax would seriously jeopardize their business. There were five or six million dollars of revenue raised from this source; and after the Ways and Means Committee over which I presided had given careful consideration to the question, in view of the fact that there was a large amount of revenue raised, that the tax was what might be called a competitive tax, because there were large importations coming into the country, and also because the manufacturers of coal-tar dyes were satisfied and asked for no further increase the committee decided not to change the rate in any particular, and passed the bill through the House leaving on coal-tar dyes the 30 per cent that was in the Dingley bill and the 30 per cent that was in the Payne bill, and that is the law to-day. There were some other dyes in the chemical schedule that were increased in the House bill; but when the bill came to the Senate, the Senate saw proper to put them back to the old rates.

Mr. President, that is the historic statement of the facts. At that time there was a very considerable importation of coal-tar dyes into this country. There is practically none to-day. The American manufacturer has almost the undisputed field in the American market; but it is contended that after the war is over this market will be jeopardized by importations from abroad. The same rate stands here to-day that stood under the Dingley bill for 14 years, when the highest protective tariff that was ever on the statute books of this country was in existence, and those who maintain that theory of levying taxes did not find any necessity for raising the tax.

When the Payne bill was written, and the case was presented to them, the importations were coming from Germany; there was nothing to interrupt the importation; but they saw no occasion to raise the tax. The manufacturers came before the Democratic Ways and Means Committee and asked for no increase; and to-day we find the country manufacturing these coal-tar dyes in the main with almost all its men in the army. A great burden of indebtedness is accumulating on that country,

and taxes must be higher. The industries of Germany are practically closed down in this line, because they have not had the men nor the market in which to produce them.

The labor required for the manufacture of coal-tar dyes is that of chemists—not ordinary common labor, but men of a high degree of education. They must be college-bred men. Many of those men to-day are buried under the battle fields of France and Russia, and never will come back to the factories again. After this war is over it will be years before this industry in Germany can be reorganized again and put on the competitive basis on which that country conducted it during the time the Dingley bill was on the statute books and the Payne bill was on the statute books.

I do not desire to delay the Senate on the important vote that awaits us this evening to go into a further discussion of this case. With no importations coming into the country to-day, knowing that after the war in Europe is over it will be years before the industry can be reorganized or put in a position where it can again compete as it did, and knowing the further fact that the rate of taxation at the customhouse to-day on the statute books is the one that had the approval of the Republican Party for 16 years, in my judgment, at least, this side of the Chamber should defeat the amendment by a solid vote.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is quite true that the duty of 30 per cent was imposed in the Dingley bill, but it is equally true that it did not develop the industry. It is equally true that it was not raised at the time of the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill. The textile manufacturers, the users of dyes, opposed any increase. They wanted it reduced. They felt that they could buy their dyestuffs cheaper in Germany, and they prevailed with the committee then, of which I happened to be a member, and maintained the rate of 30 per cent, under which it had been demonstrated that the industry could not be developed in this country.

I recognized the opposition of the textile manufacturers at that time. I knew how strong it was. I thought they were shortsighted; and now they find themselves unable to procure dyestuffs.

As for Germany having closed down those factories, those are some of the factories she has not closed down. She may not be making dyestuffs, but she is making the acids used in explosives at every factory in Germany where it is possible to make them to-day. That organization is not broken down and will not be.

As to the rates, I merely want to call attention to the statement of the committee of the American Chemical Society at Seattle in September, 1915. It is from the address of the president, Prof. Charles H. Herty, of Chapel Hill, N. C., and he refers to the report of their committee:

As a guide to what this increase should be, we have the judgment of the committee of the New York section of this society, a committee representative of all interests concerned, in the persons of B. C. Hesse, chemical expert in coal-tar dyes, chairman; H. A. Metz, for the importers; J. B. F. Herreshoff, for the manufacturers of heavy chemicals; I. F. Stone, for the American coal-tar dye producers; J. Merritt Matthews, for the textile interests; David W. Jayne, for the producers of crude coal-tar products; and Allen Rogers, chairman of the New York section. The unanimous report of this committee, which was unanimously adopted by the section, says: "It has been conclusively demonstrated during the past 30 years that the present tariff rate of 30 per cent on dyestuffs is not sufficient to induce the domestic dyestuff industry to expand at a rate comparable with the consumption of dyestuffs in this country and that, therefore, all dyestuffs made from coal tar, whether they be aniline dyes or alizarin, or alizarin dyes, or anthracene dyes or indigo, so long as they are made in whole or in part from products of or obtainable from coal tar, should all be assessed alike, namely, 30 per cent ad valorem plus 7½ cents per pound specific, and that all manufactured products of or obtainable from coal tar, themselves not dyes or colors and not medicinal, should be taxed 15 per cent ad valorem and 3½ cents per pound specific."

That is the recommendation of the American Chemical Society, and those are the figures followed in the bill. At the present moment, with no dyestuffs coming to this country, if we had the manufacturers here, of course, they would make money; but no one is going to invest money in the manufacture of dyestuffs when he knows that the industry will be destroyed as soon as the war, which at the present moment is a prohibitory tariff, ends.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is it not a fact that a large company is being organized in New York right now to make these dyes? That is my understanding.

Mr. LODGE. I do not understand that any company is ready to go on with this manufacture unless the people interested in it can get some assurance that they will not be ruined, as they have been before, by German dumping.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have seen prospectuses sent out, showing that they were seeking to raise capital, some months ago.

Mr. LODGE. I have not heard of the establishment of that industry.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, will the Senator tell me what would be the total ad valorem equivalent of the figures he read as being recommended?

Mr. LODGE. I have not figured it out. The Senator from North Carolina said it would be 75 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. About 75 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me, as he asks for information, I think the rate of duty proposed—30 per cent ad valorem and $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound specific—would amount to 45 per cent altogether.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not worked it out. I have simply seen the statement made that it was about 75 per cent, as I understood.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from North Carolina said it was 75 per cent. I understood it was 45 per cent.

At all events, Mr. President, I think we are now reaping the fruits of our improvidence. If we had given these industries suitable protection we would not now have a famine of dyestuffs and we should be able to supply ourselves with explosives. I am anxious to build up the industry chiefly because I think it is important that we should have a source from which we can draw supplies of picric acid and the other acids used in and essential to the manufacture of explosives.

This duty will, of course, produce revenue, and I think will be of great advantage to the country, of course, from my point of view as a protectionist, in building up the industry; but wholly apart from that, I think it would be of great advantage to the country to have a source for the production of these acids. I do not care to go further into the discussion.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, has this amendment been before the Committee on Finance? I mean, has it been acted upon by them?

Mr. LODGE. No; Mr. President. I took it upon myself to offer the amendment.

Mr. STONE. Oh, I am not at all criticizing what the Senator has done. I am asking for information.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; it was not submitted to the committee. I simply offered the amendment as an individual Senator, that is all. I hope the Senator does not think I have been disrespectful or have gone beyond my rights in doing so.

Mr. STONE. I have remarked that I did not. It was hardly necessary to make that remark. I am fully conscious of the fact that the Senator is proceeding entirely within his rights.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have no doubt this is a very delightful conversation, but we can not hear it over here.

Mr. LODGE. It was a delightful conversation.

SEVERAL SENATORS. And complimentary?

Mr. STONE. No; it was agreeable.

Mr. LODGE. Perfectly.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I am not sure that I am ready to vote on this proposition.

Mr. GALLINGER. For it?

Mr. STONE. I am not sure that I am ready to vote on it—for it or against it. I am impressed with the idea that it is of very great importance to the industries of this country that the subject of the manufacture of dyes should be given very thoughtful and attentive consideration. Just what ought to be done with respect to it, I am not prepared to say to my own satisfaction. I should have been glad to have this measure considered fully by the Committee on Finance, and all the facts gone into and the needs of the situation well understood. While it is true that 30 per cent ad valorem has been the tax prevailing for a great many years, that fact alone is not sufficient to satisfy me that it is the rate that ought to be prescribed.

I feel that this is rather an exceptional case—the making of dyes—the building up of the dye industry in the United States. I could go on here giving some reasons that impress me, at least, but I do not care at this time to go into it or to provoke discussion with regard to it. I should have been very glad, however, to have the matter made the subject of a sufficient inquiry and discussion, to have had the facts laid before us afresh, to enable us to pass upon it with a greater degree of intelligence, I think, than the Senate is about to pass upon it.

While the Senator has acted with great propriety and entirely within the limits of his rights, I regret that he has seen proper to throw this matter into the Senate in this connection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Missouri that this is an exceptional case. That is the only thing

that led me to offer the amendment—not because I do not think there are other items in the tariff law which ought to be changed, but because I think this is very exceptional.

Last summer the Secretary of War pointed out to the country the necessity of building up the dyestuffs industry, with a view to the manufacture of explosives. The matter has been before the committee. I have heard reports that the party responsible for legislation were about to bring it forward, and I have been hoping that they would do so. I should have been glad to unite with them in any legislation looking to the building up of this industry, which I think involves a great deal more than the mere question of a rate of duty or a rate of taxation or the development of an industry. Nothing has been done, however, and the winter has gone, so I have offered this amendment. I wanted to bring it to the attention of the Senate. I have offered it in the form recommended by the American Chemical Society, and embodied in a bill by Mr. HILL, of Connecticut, in the House. I merely wish to bring it to the attention of the Senate and ask a vote upon it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss this matter, because I do not think the Senate is likely to adopt as an amendment a bill that is now pending in the other House and is being given, by the Ways and Means Committee of that body, very serious consideration. While I have not the remotest idea that they will adopt this particular bill, I think the probabilities are that that committee will bring out some bill to meet the extraordinary situation which the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Missouri correctly state exists with reference to this particular industry.

As chairman of the Committee on Finance, I have myself had a number of consultations, together with other majority members of the committee, with persons interested in this industry. Last week I held quite a lengthy conference with certain gentlemen who represent jointly the manufacturers of dyestuffs and colors and acids and the textile manufacturers. I was given to understand that they did not desire, nor did they need, the great increase provided in the Hill bill. They were not asking for that; neither did they think that their industry had been altogether suppressed in this country by reason of inadequate tariff protection. They rather attributed—and I think there is good ground for that—the fact that the industry in this country has not developed under the high protective rates that have obtained heretofore, especially those that obtained a great many years ago, that were much higher than the Payne-Aldrich rates, to the fact that certain countries in Europe, by combination, had acquired a world monopoly, and had employed to suppress the development of the industry in this country the methods that are ordinarily employed by trusts. I understand that these gentlemen desire some protection against that; and, as the Senator from Massachusetts has said, the Secretary of Commerce and his force up there, in connection with the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, have been working upon that side of the question.

Mr. President, I have no doubt during the session, both on this side of Congress and the other side, this matter will be given serious consideration, and of course there ought not to be any action regarding a matter so important upon an amendment offered here to another bill, which has never been before the committee and which has had no consideration whatever.

Even under the present circumstances the dye industry in this country is making very rapid progress. The Senator referred to some large industry established in some other State than the one I have in mind. In my own State I read the other day a very interesting account of arrangements which have already been perfected for the establishment at Sanford, in that State, of a very large plant for the manufacture of dyestuffs, and all over the country they are beginning to establish factories for this purpose. I have here a statement contained in a speech made not long since by Dr. Edward Ewing Pratt, who is Chief of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Labor, in which he says:

Since the outbreak of the European war the American coal-tar dyestuff industry has made great strides forward. The factories in existence at that time have greatly increased their output. New establishments for the manufacture of intermediates have been brought into existence. Thousands of tons of benzol and coal tar heretofore recklessly wasted are now being saved and utilized.

The census of manufactures taken in 1909 reported the total output of coal-tar dyestuffs manufactured in this country to be 5,890,000 pounds, valued at \$1,813,000. The output was probably much increased over these figures at the time of the outbreak of the European war. Since that time the five domestic concerns manufacturing dyestuffs have doubled their outputs. Another factory, the branch of a large German firm, has greatly increased its output. Still another factory manufacturing aniline has quadrupled its output.

But the great need and the great demand for dyestuffs have also brought many new concerns into the field. There are now nine new plants making aniline and intermediates. Their total output is approximately 18,000 pounds daily. One new plant for manufacturing

dyestuffs, capitalized at \$2,000,000, is now in existence, and is producing at the rate of 1,000 pounds daily. Another plant will be ready for operation about November 1. Another company, capitalized at \$15,000,000, has started plans for extensive works in different sections of the country.

Our total production of coal-tar dyestuff materials at the present moment is probably over three times the production prior to the European war.

Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss this matter any further. I hope we will now have a vote.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I think this is a very important amendment. The Senator from North Carolina states that there is a bill pending in the House, but I understand the House committee has not even reported the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. They have had hearings, I will say to the Senator, and quite extensive hearings, showing that it has been considered there.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand. I had no idea this amendment was to be offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, and I am free to say I am not prepared to discuss the matter extensively; but when the Senator from Massachusetts stated that his amendment was the bill introduced by Mr. HILL, of Connecticut, I turned to the RECORD to see what he had said about that question in the House. I find here in the RECORD under date of February 14, 1916, on page 2523 of the RECORD, the remarks of Mr. HILL upon this industry, upon its history, upon the various rates of duty which have been imposed upon these articles in the past, and there are certainly some most astounding statements in his speech, astounding in that they show the absolute dependence upon—not to say abject subjection of this country to—Germany in this whole question of dyestuffs and acids and chemical products.

I will read just one extract, which is the testimony of Dr. Pratt, who is the chief of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, and it is said to appear on page 202 of the hearings. He says:

The European artificial dyestuff industry is more than a large and prosperous industry. It is a highly organized combination of manufacturers seeking not only to enlarge their output and to compete with similar manufacturers in other parts of the world, but carrying on a definite industrial program looking to the control of the market and the ultimate elimination of important competitors. This factor in the situation has made it practically impossible for the American dyestuff industry up to the present time to get a really firm foothold, and has made it necessary for us to import a large proportion of our dyestuffs and has placed us in the position where we find ourselves to-day, practically in the midst of a dyestuff famine.

The methods used by the European dyestuff manufacturers should not be unfamiliar to us Americans. When an American manufacturer has developed a certain dye and is selling it in considerable quantities the European manufacturers have suddenly reduced the price far below the actual cost of production, either in this country or abroad, and hence the American manufacturer has been forced to withdraw quite rapidly from the manufacture of that particular dye. These unfair methods of competition on the part of our competitors in Europe would not be tolerated for a moment under the recent trust legislation except for the fact that those who are responsible for these methods are not amenable to the laws of the United States.

In glancing hurriedly over this speech of Mr. HILL numerous instances are given of the situation of our manufacturers at present. In reference to one concern it is testified that it was compelled to pay for its dyes alone over \$300,000 more during 1915 than it did during 1914. We all know—every Senator and Representative knows—the distress that all the producers of textiles who use these dyes have been in during the last year.

I am very glad the Senator from Massachusetts offered this amendment. If there is a similar measure pending in the House, it seems to me Democratic Senators might well enough allow this amendment to go to conference, and if the House committee intends to do anything to help relieve this famine and the extortion of our citizens by this foreign trust—for it is a great foreign trust—they can, if they choose, modify what we propose and let the conference committee report out what may be agreed upon in conference and put it on a bill that will stand some chance of getting through both Houses at the present session.

Owing to the situation of the public business in the House, the amount of time taken up on contested matters, I am free to say that I am not at all optimistic that any legislation on this subject which will be of any substantial benefit will receive any consideration worthy of the name on the floor of the House if reported out as an independent measure. I think if our Democratic friends are as sincere in their desire to try to make this Nation not utterly dependent upon a belligerent for this great necessity, now is the chance to demonstrate it and let this amendment go on the bill and go to conference at least. They will control both branches of the conferees, and no damage will be done by letting it go there and getting some consideration.

While I wish I were better prepared to speak upon this matter than I am, I felt that I would like to say as much as I have said.

Mr. BRANDEGEE subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have permission to have incorporated in the remarks which I made a few moments ago a letter to Mr. LONGWORTH, of the House of Representatives, and also a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Speaker of the House, which appear on page 5247 of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letters referred to are as follows:

NEW YORK, February 23, 1916.

Mr. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
Room 319, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just read the copy of Congressman HILL's speech before Congress on the dyestuff bill (H. R. 702), and on page 11 I read that yourself and Mr. HILL discussed the writer's statement before the Ways and Means Committee regarding our recent dyestuff purchases in China.

In order to have the matter entirely correct in your mind, I would say that you will find, on page 119 of the printed hearing before the Ways and Means Committee on the dyestuff bill that the writer answered your question as to exorbitant cost of dyestuffs, stating that my company had just paid \$5.75 a pound for aniline black (made by Badische, in Germany), which we had purchased from China.

These identical goods in normal times would have cost us 20 cents per pound, or a total of \$1,748, whereas we are now compelled to pay more than \$52,000.

Since that time we have made another purchase of same goods from Shanghai, paying \$7.50 per pound instead of \$5.75, and on February 14 last we were quoted \$12 a pound for exactly the same material from China.

This latest quotation means an advance of 6,000 per cent over the normal before-the-war figure of 20 cents per pound.

Yours, very truly,

R. H. COMEY Co.,
Geo. W. WILKIE,
For the Company.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 9, 1916.

SIR: Owing to conditions arising out of the European war, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which prepares all Government notes and other securities, national bank notes and Federal reserve notes, postage and revenue stamps, and currency of the Philippine government, has found it impossible to purchase colors for inks in sufficient quantities in the United States to carry on its work. It has been compelled for over a year to use cheap and unsatisfactory substitutes for some of the colors, and as time has gone on even these substitutes have become more and more difficult to purchase, and it seems to be only a question of a short time until the supply of them will be exhausted. At present the Bureau of Engraving and Printing has only two weeks' supply of reds and blues, which are the most important colors used by it.

Some time ago an order for 145,000 pounds of blues and reds was placed in Germany, and through the assistance of the State Department permission was granted for the exportation of these colors. The first of several consignments has just reached this country. Under the tariff act some, if not all, of these colors are dutiable, and it seems to me it is proper at this time and under these conditions for Congress by joint resolution to authorize the importation of all of these colors free. It is impossible to buy these colors here. The prices that are now paid for them in Germany are higher than the prices before the war plus the duty. The duty will be approximately \$12,000, and it will be necessary to go to Congress for a deficiency appropriation if this duty is paid. There can be no question of this importation injuring in any manner any American industry.

I therefore have the honor to request that a joint resolution authorizing the admission free of duty of approximately 145,000 pounds of dry colors, valued at \$40,000 to \$50,000 (the exact amount not being determinable at this time owing to the fluctuations of exchange), from Germany for the use of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the same having been ordered December 10, 1915, and shipment being made to and in the name of the Secretary of the Treasury, said colors to be exclusively for the use of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, may be passed by Congress. As part of these colors has already been shipped and some of them are now in this country, I request that immediate action on this resolution may be taken, if possible.

I inclose herewith a suggested form of resolution.

Respectfully,

BYRON R. NEWTON,
Acting Secretary.

HON. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Mr. President, I am ready to vote at the proper time for any duty upon dyestuffs that may be necessary to establish or encourage their manufacture in this country and to make our textile mills independent of the manufacturers abroad for all the dyes which they use. But it seems to me we ought to have more information than we have at present, and that this is not the proper place to introduce the amendment and call for action on this very important matter.

I remember very well having something to do with the chemical schedule of the last tariff bill, as a member of the Finance Committee, and the attitude of the textile mills of New England toward any additional duties on dyestuffs. I recall that the Underwood bill, as it came to the Senate from the House, carried a duty upon anthracene and alizarin, and dyes derived from them, and upon indigo, which had hitherto been upon the free list, and I remember the attitude of all the textile mills of New England, and largely throughout the country, in regard to an increase of duties or placing duties on articles which had

theretofore been on the free list. There were protests and delegations visited Washington. I remember they came from some of the mills in New England which were large users of these dyes.

I realize that there is a hardship at this time, that they are compelled to pay largely increased prices owing to the cutting off of the importation of dyes which they are compelled to use; but, with no chance to investigate the matter, with no hearings by any committee of the Senate, with no investigation and no report, it seems to me we have no information upon which to act, as to what the duty ought to be now, and what action should be taken. I say this in explanation of the vote which I shall cast.

Mr. SIMMONS. I may say that in an informal way the committee has been considering it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. But not the committee of the Senate; the committee of the House.

Mr. SIMMONS. The committee of the Senate in an informal way, the members of the committee, certainly myself as chairman, have been considering and studying the data, conferring with those interested both in the manufacture of dyes and those engaged in the textile industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I am very glad to have that information from the Senator from North Carolina, but I do not understand that any bill is pending or has been referred to the committee for consideration.

Mr. SIMMONS. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I simply wished to say this in explanation of my vote at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can not see that it makes any difference whether this amendment has been referred to the Finance Committee or not. There never has been a tariff bill presented to the Senate since I have been a Member when there have not been amendments offered that had never been referred to the committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly, for a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course the Senator understands that no one is questioning the right of the Senator from Massachusetts to offer the amendment in this way, without having it go before the committee?

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that; and I also understand that I have no apology or excuse to offer for my vote on this amendment as Senators on the other side of the Chamber are doing. I do not have to get up on the floor of the Senate and say this is not the proper time to vote for it. I know as well as I know I am alive that the present rate of duty will never fully establish the industry in this country. I have said so upon this floor not once but a dozen times. When the manufacturers of the East were here, as the Senator from Maine has said, pleading that the rate be not increased, I have always said that it was selfishness upon their part, and now the conditions of the world are such that it has brought it home to them and they find themselves next to helpless.

Mr. President, it is not only the coal-tar dyes that need protection in the chemical schedule, it is the schedule as a whole. Since the passage of the tariff act I have called the attention of the Senate upon two occasions to the utter destruction by it of the manufacture of chemicals in this country. The machinery has been thrown to the junk pile, and that, Mr. President, will continue if there is no change in this schedule after the war is over and matters become normal.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. What is the average duty now on the chemical schedule?

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator mean taking the schedule as a whole?

Mr. OWEN. Yes; all the way through.

Mr. SMOOT. I should judge about 23 or 24 per cent, although I have not looked it up of late.

Mr. OWEN. What is the labor cost?

Mr. SMOOT. I would say that the labor cost in a few classes of chemicals is very low indeed. There are others where the labor cost is as high as 85 per cent. So I can not state to the Senator what the average would be.

Mr. OWEN. The reason why I called the attention of the Senator to it was because the average, as shown by the tariff bill in 1909, when those figures were made up, was 8 per cent as against 28 per cent average. The labor cost was only 8 per cent on an average, while the total levy was 28 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know who made up the figures, but if there is any man in this country or any other country who says

the full line of chemicals and dyestuffs as covered by the chemical schedule in the tariff law of 1913 is only 8 per cent says something that is absolutely untrue. It can not be. I do not know who made up the figures, but they are wrong, or else the Senator from Oklahoma has misunderstood his informant.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I will state that the 28 per cent was made up by the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and the 8 per cent was made up by figures which I found in the census and which I made up myself, and I know, therefore, they are correct.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator made them up himself, he certainly missed a great part of the cost of manufacturing chemicals. There is no question about that.

I am not going into a discussion of the tariff question at this time. I am ready to vote upon this amendment. I think it ought to be adopted, and I believe myself there are many Democrats in this body who believe it ought to be adopted. If you are going to build up this industry, I say it will not only require a change in the coal-tar paragraph, but it will require a change in the whole schedule, and the sooner it comes the better it will be for the country.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I dislike very much to be required to vote on this amendment with the information the Senate has before it. For some time now we have read a great deal in the press, including some statements from officials to the effect that there ought to be action by Congress in regard to the dyestuff proposition. I am not certain if the evidence were produced that I would not support this amendment. I would like to vote for a law that would bring about the development of this industry. But we have here offered from the floor of the Senate an amendment which has not received the consideration of any committee or of any official. No investigation has been made as to whether the rates fixed in the amendment are reasonable and fair, and no Senator has offered, at least to my satisfaction, any evidence showing that the rates provided for in the amendment are proper and just.

I am not finding fault with the Senator from Massachusetts for offering the amendment on the floor of the Senate without the consideration of the committee, and we could consider and act on it if it were on a subject of which we had general knowledge or on which the Senator could give us definite information as to the cost of production and other things that ought to be taken into consideration in fixing a just tariff. I should like to vote for a bill or an amendment that would develop this industry. It seems to me the desirability of its development has been shown by recent events during the war. But the tariff now on the statute books is one that was placed there a great many years ago. I understand it was in the Dingley law; that it was in the Payne-Aldrich law, and that it is in the present Democratic law without any change. If those different changes of the tariff had made a change in this rate, we would have had something on which to base our judgment, but it does not seem to me to be quite fair to expect us to vote for tariff rates upon an important question like this without having some evidence as to what would be a fair and sufficient tariff to develop the industry. It certainly is not a scientific way of making a tariff bill, especially upon the subject of dyestuffs, as to which Senators are not informed and the ordinary person has no direct information.

Therefore it strikes me that it is my duty to vote against the amendment. I do so without intending to condemn it or to say that I should not vote for it if the proper showing were made in its behalf.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I shall not consume very much time, but some question has been raised as to whether or not there is any satisfactory evidence before the Senate on the wisdom or unwisdom of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The Secretary of Commerce has given us divers kinds of advice on a great many subjects, and among them is the line of merchandise mentioned in this amendment. The only criticism I have to make on his suggestions is the manner in which he describes the dyestuff industry in this country. He refers to it as an "incipient industry." I might criticize the phrase, but we have government by phrase making now very largely, and this is probably in keeping with other branches of the service. I have understood that the word "incipient" ordinarily applied to various epidemics, such as smallpox, measles, and the like, but I never understood that an industry in this country was classified as a disease, except by this administration. This

industry is referred to as an "incipient industry." It may have been an inadvertence or it may have been intentional, but with this preliminary explanation, Mr. President, I wish to read what Secretary Redfield said. I unfortunately did not observe in the dispatch in which this address was reported the particular place where it was delivered, and I am now trusting to my memory in order to give it a habitation. I think, however, it was at Trenton, N. J., in which he used the following language, which I commend to my brother from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]:

Capital hesitates under existing conditions to embark heavily in an undertaking where there is a strong probability, if not a certainty, that upon the return of normal conditions an incipient, half-developed American industry would be exposed to prolonged and relentless underselling by foreign competitors possessing almost boundless resources, financial and technical.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator if he has any evidence before him in regard to the rates which are proposed in this amendment? Are they fair? Would they develop the industry? Are they too high or too low?

Mr. SHERMAN. I can only give the Senator an opinion. There is nothing in the recommendation made by the Secretary of Commerce bearing on the subject.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that. The question upon which I was particularly seeking light was not so much as to whether we should pass some law for the development of this industry, but what ought to be the rates in such a new law.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator ask whether the rates proposed in the amendment are reasonable or fair or otherwise?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I can only give my own opinion that I have formed upon such investigation as I have been able to make and such information as I have been able to gather in a general way without any special knowledge of the industry. I will say that I am willing to vote for the amendment. I believe the rates proposed in it are not out of the way in view of the condition that we are now facing.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to the question asked by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for a question or for a speech, or does he yield the floor?

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, I do not understand the ruling that was made the other day, but that does not make any difference. I am perfectly willing to yield the floor if it is necessary.

Mr. SMOOT. I will not proceed.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am unable to state what the rule is in the Senate. We voted both ways on it. I am willing to yield the floor to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want the Senator to yield the floor to me.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Since this inquiry—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think we had better not have another speech.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, it is not—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I thought the Senator from Illinois was about to take his seat.

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir. I will not yield to the Senator from New Jersey except for a question, but I shall be very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I thought the Senator from Illinois had concluded his remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has not concluded.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Very well.

Mr. SHERMAN. I shall be glad at any time to yield to the Senator from New Jersey for a question.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. My purpose was not so much to ask a question as it was to give—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will say what I desire to say later.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I have myself enough information to vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts, and I sincerely hope that the amendment may be adopted. It will not only furnish the ground upon which this industry may recover itself, but it is to be hoped it will produce some additional revenue; and while that is not the primary pur-

pose of many of us on this side of the Chamber, yet it is a matter that ought not to be cast lightly aside. We are needing some additional revenue. If the amendment should be adopted, upon both grounds it would, in my judgment, be a very wise provision. While we can not originate money bills, we can by way of amendment propose them and send them across to the other House, and in that way give them at least a valid excuse to consider them before a committee. So, in the case of this amendment, if it should be adopted by the Senate, it would be an indication that we are soberly considering the question involved.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, apropos of this matter and since this discussion on the question of dyestuffs, prompted by the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I called up the Department of Commerce to learn as nearly as I could what the situation might be. A number of gentlemen in New Jersey interested in the manufacture of aniline dyes have appealed to me by letter and some have called on me personally. A day or two ago I had occasion to go to Jersey City, where I noticed a number of large plants devoted to the manufacture of dyes and dyestuffs, and I observed that enormous additions to them were being built. Hence I was prompted to make inquiry of the Department of Commerce. They tell me that we are now manufacturing in this country a little over half the amount of dyestuffs we consumed before the war. So we are not utterly prostrate and do not need the tickling of an additional tariff.

I then inquired of the department what their knowledge was as to the construction of plants for the further manufacture of aniline dyes, and they informed me that under the present tariff the dyestuff plants are putting up additions on all sides, and the only difficulty now is not the lack of capital, because capital is freely and plentifully offered, but the only trouble is to get adequate quantities of machinery required for the manufacture of these dyes. The tariff seems amply adequate, according to the department, for the establishment of plants and the manufacture of all the needed dyes.

Now, this eternal call for a little more, this cry "hold me up by the chin that I may survive a little longer," is not only heard with reference to dyestuffs but it is heard with reference to sugar, and to the sugar bill the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts is sought to be tacked on. I want to say for myself as to the sugar question that I believe sugar is vitally necessary for the welfare of man, and, in addition, in ordinary slang parlance it is sometimes said when we have money with which to buy that we have "the sugar." So sugar is necessary not only in connection with the purse but for our physical well-being.

This question was all thrashed out before the people some time ago, and in the Senate of the United States we pronounced in favor of a free breakfast table. That was our slogan, and with that slogan we went before the people. We promised a free breakfast table to the people, and we voted for it. They believed in it, and I believe in it as much now as ever; but there has been a perpetual propaganda on the part of a few men—and there are comparatively few interested in the sugar industry—and they have been keeping up the never-ending clamor that we must continue the tariff on sugar. I have heard it right along from the day we pledged ourselves to vote for free sugar.

The brief visit I made to Hawaii during the past summer opened my eyes as to sugar. If there ever was a sugar oligarchy on God's footstool, I know it is the sugar oligarchy in the islands of Hawaii, now a part of the United States. I have been advocating free sugar, and I told my friends in New Jersey that I was in favor of abolishing the duty of 25 cents a bushel on their potatoes. I voted for that conscientiously, and they are getting a better price for their potatoes now than they ever did before. I voted for that with all the relish in the world; and yet I now find myself confronted with a situation where I must vote to impose a duty on sugar. We are all agriculturists in a way, though there are very few of us who are real farmers; but I should like some one to find me a product known to man and cultivated in the United States that will produce a return equivalent to the return produced by sugar in the islands of Hawaii; and yet under the provision of the pending bill we are to continue longer the duty on sugar. In Hawaii the product runs from a minimum of 3 tons up to 5 and even 7 tons, not of sugar cane but of raw sugar, per acre. Put that into dollars, and then I ask you, with what grace can our Democratic Party go before the people and advocate a duty on sugar?

I am not telling tales out of school, but you all know that the Democratic Senators had a caucus, and it was agreed that we should support the bill which has been presented by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. I there voiced my protest and

cast my vote against it, but I was so overwhelmingly buried—there was but one other, I think, who voted "nay" with me—that finally, in deference to the opinion of my party and their counsels, but much against my judgment, I agreed to vote to continue the tariff on sugar; but, so help me, I will not vote for an increased tariff on dyestuffs while present prospects are so good.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey tell me whether the Department of Commerce informed him that in this country we are only making 2 colors out of a total of 1,800 different colors made by German manufacturers of dyestuffs?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. They did not say that; but, since the Senator has brought that out, they said that we do not produce the same variety of colors as is produced in Germany.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think that agrees with my statement.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, that is all right.

Mr. LODGE. We are making about 15 colors, while there are about 1,800.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not know whether 1,800 is absolutely the correct number, but I understand that it depends very much upon a man's condition as to how many shades he sees in the rainbow. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there has been an intimation, if not a direct statement, that the rates upon coal-tar dyes are the same to-day as they were under the Dingley law, but I wish to call attention to one difference. When the Dingley law was in operation there was a rate of duty upon coal-tar dyes of 30 per cent, as stated by every Senator who has mentioned the subject, but the Senate has not been informed that under the Dingley law all the intermediate products came in free. There is a long list of them, and therefore I will not read them to the Senate, but any Senator who is interested can look up the paragraph and find them.

Some of these products are absolutely necessary to the dye manufacturers of this country, and they are required to get them from Germany. Many of them are made nowhere else. Many of them are the products that go into the thousand different colors that are not manufactured in this country. The Underwood-Simmons law, instead of leaving those products that could not be made in this country upon the free list, imposed a duty upon them of 10 per cent. Therefore the coal-tar dye manufacturers of this country are not in the same condition as they were under the Dingley law.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. SMOOT. I yield for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me that that emphasizes the fact which I previously endeavored to state—that we are not now in a position to legislate intelligently on this subject. I should like to ask the Senator whether, if, instead of adopting the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, we should put on the free list the other ingredients which he has mentioned and which it is necessary to use in order to make these dyes, would not that bring the proper relief and would not that be better than to increase the tariff on these commodities?

Mr. SMOOT. It would bring a certain relief, I will say to the Senator, but not such relief that the business could live after normal conditions in the world are established.

Mr. NORRIS. How can the Senator say that? What evidence—and this is one of the things I wanted to find out—has the Senator as to the cost of the manufacture of these articles here and abroad?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have called the attention of the Senate many times to the facts showing the difference in the wage paid in Germany and in this country, beginning with the chemist down to the very lowest class of labor engaged in the manufacture of chemicals; and I say to the Senator now that the wage paid in German institutions in the manufacture of chemicals and dyes is not to exceed one-quarter of the wage paid in this country. And I want the Senator to understand that in stating that I say it because I know it. Another thing is that the German people as a people have made a study of the question of making and manufacturing dyes as no other people on earth have done. They produce alizarins, which we never produce in this country. They produce a thousand kinds of colors for which the world depends upon Germany, and, Mr. President, the policy of Germany has been in the past, wherever there is established anywhere in the United States a factory of any size for producing chemicals, to ship into this country, even if at prices below cost, until they closed the American factory.

I could call the attention of the Senator, if he wanted it, this afternoon, and if I had the time, to a dozen such instances.

Not only that, Mr. President, combinations are allowed in Germany, and they have been made so powerful in capital and organization that no matter in what part of the world other people begin to manufacture chemicals, the German combination simply go to work and undersell until they close them up, and the balance of the world pays the amount that is lost in advance prices until it is accomplished. I do not state this on hearsay. That is stated in reports from Germany herself.

Mr. President, it seems to me that any Senator who desires to see this industry established in this country should vote for the amendment that has been offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. It is 30 per cent ad valorem and 7½ cents per pound specific duty, and on some things I think that would amount to perhaps 75 per cent, and maybe more on some of the cheaper articles. Upon the great quantity of them, the high-priced products, it would be less than that, not to exceed 40 or 45 per cent. It seems to me, Mr. President, that what the country is passing through now, the condition in which we find ourselves, ought to teach every Senator who has a vote to cast to establish this industry in this country that now is the time to do it.

I want to say, further, Mr. President, that you will find that the clothing that the people wear in this country will not be so fast in color as it has been in the past, because we are not prepared to make the required product. I say that we never will be prepared unless we have a protective tariff sufficient for the manufacturers of this country to get established. I know that the rate proposed in this amendment is none too high to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me just for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. I will.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I wish to ask for what reason the Senator can ask for this additional duty, when, if these statements are correct as I get them from the department, capital is to-day, under the present duty of 35 per cent—

Mr. SMOOT. Thirty per cent.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Thirty per cent—capital is to-day rushing in and building up the plants as rapidly as it can. The department says that the only delay is due to the fact that the manufacturers can not get the machinery. If that is so, why does the Senator ask for more duty?

Mr. SMOOT. Why, Mr. President, the capital that is going into this business to-day expects, and rightfully expects, that it will be more than a year before the plants in Germany get established in making these products again in the quantities that they used to, and the manufacturers know that at the prices they are paying to-day, if they can get one year's run, they will nearly clear the cost of their mill. I want to say to the Senator that the reds that are used in printing our currency we used to buy for 40 cents a pound, and the Government of the United States is paying \$4 per pound for them to-day. How long it will take a manufacturer to make his plant clear, and perhaps make a profit, the same as the manufacturers of munitions of war are making to-day—and I was going to say a great many other industries in this country. But as soon as the war is over a change will come.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. I will; for a question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is it not a fact that even if Germany were producing these dyes in sufficient quantities to-day, they could not be gotten into this country?

Mr. SMOOT. It is absolutely true.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is not that one good reason why capital would go in, having the entire American market, and only being able to supply half the demand, if it is up against no foreign competition at all?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; and I want to say to the Senator from New Jersey that if he will go with me I will show him invoices for coal-tar dyes two years ago and invoices for the same colors purchased the last three months, and he will find that there has not been a slight increase of 10, 15, or 20 per cent, but he will find that there has been an increase in some instances of hundreds of per cent.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I realize all that.

Mr. SMOOT. And, Mr. President, it is natural under the conditions existing. Many of the manufacturers can not get what they want even with the prices asked and they are willing to pay, and the products that they are manufacturing to-day are not what the manufacturers of this country want. Blacks and light colors are being used as much as possible, in order that the American manufacturer will secure dyes in sufficient quantities to run the mills. I think, of course, the American customer, under the circumstances, will recognize this fact

and make his purchases accordingly; and I will say it is safer to buy a straight black this year than any other color, if fastness of color is desired.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I should like to ask the Senator whether there is any assurance that if we should adopt this bill we will get the rebate, and get clear down to the original prices again? With the subsidy to the dyestuff manufacturers that they will be granted under this additional stipend that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts proposes, they will not lower the prices. They will hold the prices up just as high, even after the war, as they are to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is not a question.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from New Jersey, I will say that when normal conditions exist in the world again, competition will then bring prices down. I will admit that the increase in this rate, which is 7½ cents per pound, will in many, many cases enable the manufacturers of this country to proceed with the manufacturing of coal-tar dyes. In many cases it will not. But I will say to the Senator that 7½ cents a pound on the dyestuffs which cost a dollar a pound that go into the manufacturing of his clothing would not amount to one-tenth of a cent a yard. The Senator would not buy his clothing for any less; no one would; but perhaps we can have American labor make these products, instead of the products being made in a foreign country. That is the object of the amendment, and that is the only reason why I would vote for it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be read. I have been absent during the discussion, in attendance upon a subcommittee, and I have not heard the amendment read. I should like to hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I noticed when it was read before that some words were not plainly understood by those of us who were listening. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cautions the Secretary to pronounce the words correctly.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Massachusetts proposes to add the following to the amendment offered by the committee:

That on and after the day following the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the articles named herein when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions, except the Philippine Islands and the Islands of Guam and Tutulla, the rates of duties which are herein prescribed, namely:

DUTYABLE LIST.

1. All products of coal, produced in commercial quantities through the destructive distillation of coal or otherwise, such as benzol, toluol, xylol, cumol, naphthalin, methylnaphthalin, azenaphten, fluorin, anthracene, phenol, cresol, pyridin, chinolin, carbazol, and other not specially provided for and not colors or dyes, 5 per cent ad valorem.
2. All the so-called "intermediates," made from the products referred to in paragraph 1, not colors or dyes, not specially provided for, 3½ cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.
3. All colors or dyes derived from coal, 7½ cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem.

FREE LIST.

4. Acids: Acetic or pyroligneous, arsenic or arsenious, chromic, fluoric, hydrofluoric, hydrochloric or muriatic, nitric, phosphoric, prussic, silicic, sulphuric or oil of vitriol, and valerianic.
 5. Coal tar, crude, pitch of coal tar, wood or other tar, dead or cresote oil.
 6. Indigo, natural.
- Sec. 2. That paragraphs 20, 21, 22, and 23 of Schedule A of section 1 of an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved 9 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m., October 3, 1913, and paragraphs 387, 394, 432, and 514 of the "free list" of section 1 of said act, and so much of any heretofore existing law or parts of law as may be inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think probably there is no other Senator who desires to speak on this matter, and I move to lay the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts on the table.

Mr. LODGE. I think we can get a direct vote, Mr. President.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well; I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. LODGE. This is on the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the adoption of the amendment.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who is absent. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from North

Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. I am informed that if the Senator from Connecticut were present he would vote "yea," and if I were able to vote I would vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I see he is not present, and I shall have to withhold my vote, as I do not know how he would vote on this question.

Mr. OWEN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is absent. On that account I withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GORF] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENNOSE] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I am compelled to withdraw my vote, as I see that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has not voted, and I have a pair with him.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM];

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN].

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Borah	Curtis	Nelson	Sterling
Brandegee	Jones	Oliver	Wadsworth
Burleigh	Kenyon	Page	Weeks
Clapp	La Follette	Poindexter	Works
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Sherman	
Colt	Lodge	Smith, Mich.	
Cummins	McCumber	Smoot	

NAYS—41.

Ashurst	Lane	Robinson	Taggart
Bankhead	Lewis	Saulsbury	Thomas
Broussard	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Thompson
Chamberlain	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Tillman
Chilton	Norris	Shields	Underwood
Hardwick	Owen	Simmons	Vardaman
Hitchcock	Phelan	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh
Hollis	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Husting	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.	
Johnson, Me.	Ransdell	Stone	
Kern	Reed	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—30.

Beckham	Fail	James	Overman
Brady	Fletcher	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pentose
Bryan	Gallinger	Lea, Tenn.	Smith, Md.
Catron	Goff	Lee, Md.	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Gore	McLean	Townsend
Culberson	Gronna	Myers	Warren
Dillingham	Harding	Newlands	
du Pont	Hughes	O'Gorman	

So Mr. LODGE's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I had supposed that a vote would not be called for upon the bill this afternoon. I have an amendment that I desire to submit and support by a few remarks. I am not prepared to do so this evening. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina whether there is any reason why the bill should be pressed to a vote this afternoon?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that the only reason was that no Senator was ready to speak this afternoon, and I thought in view of the fact that we have a very short time before the 1st of May, the sooner we get this matter into

conference, where we anticipate there will be some little difference between the House and the Senate, the better. I was advised that there was no Senator on the other side of the Chamber who desires to speak.

Mr. WORKS. Then, evidently, I was not consulted on the subject. I do desire to present an amendment and support it very briefly. Probably it will not take me more than half an hour, but I can not do it now.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is there any reason why the Senator can not proceed now? I think we ought to get this matter out of the way as quickly as possible, so that the military bill may be taken up. It is important legislation, and I hope the Senator will not hold up the whole matter.

Mr. WORKS. I think under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator ought not to press this measure to a vote now, when a Senator desires to be heard upon it and is not prepared to go on at this time.

Mr. SIMMONS. The unanimous-consent agreement, if the Senator will permit me, was that we would vote not later than 5 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. WORKS. I think Senators had a right to assume—

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course under that agreement we can vote at any time when we are ready.

Mr. WORKS. We are not ready to vote now, when a Senator desires to submit an amendment to-morrow and speak upon it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Under the unanimous-consent agreement we were to proceed to the consideration of this bill beginning at 12 o'clock to-day and—

Mr. WORKS. I have no desire to delay the bill, but I do desire an opportunity to present what I have to say upon the amendment I shall propose, and I took it for granted that under the unanimous-consent agreement the bill would not be pressed to a vote this afternoon. I hardly think the Senator would desire to do that under the circumstances.

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course the Senator understands I do not desire to do anything that is discourteous to any Senator, and if the Senator states that he wants to speak and is not ready to speak this afternoon, I would not feel in face of that like insisting on a vote.

Mr. WORKS. That is what I have been saying.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has stated what ought to be the action of the Senate. On this side of the Chamber we have hastened the passage of this bill. We have been anxious to have it passed. I have not agreed with some of the arguments that have been made in behalf of its passage, but it is inevitable that it is to pass and the Treasury needs the revenue. For that reason we have had no disposition to halt it.

Mr. President, it was distinctly understood that we would have most of to-morrow to discuss the bill, if anyone wished to discuss it, or to offer an amendment; and, when the Senator from California says he desires to offer an amendment and is not ready to do so now, there ought to be no controversy as to the bill going over until to-morrow.

Mr. STONE. There is none.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope no effort will be made to force it.

Mr. SIMMONS. There is none. If the Senator from California says he is not ready to offer an amendment now, I, of course, do not press the bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

Mr. KERN. I move the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m., Monday, April 10, 1916) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 11, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 10 (legislative day of March 30), 1916.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank Campbell to be receiver of public moneys at O'Neill, Nebr.

Arnold F. Beeler to be receiver of public moneys at North Platte, Nebr.

John P. Robertson to be receiver of public moneys at Broken Bow, Nebr.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Eugene J. Eames to be register of the land office at North Platte, Nebr.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Howard A. Flanagan to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Otto M. Forster to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Chauncey R. Murray to be an assistant paymaster.

Boatswain Benjamin F. Singles to be a chief boatswain.

Boatswain Frank G. Mehling to be a chief boatswain.

Gunner Joseph Chamberlain to be a chief gunner.

Machinist Stephen H. Badgett to be a chief machinist.

Machinist Jonathan H. Warman to be a chief machinist.

John F. Huddleston to be an assistant paymaster.

POSTMASTERS.

MISSOURI.

Clyde G. Eubank, Madison.

A. S. J. Martin, East Prairie.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, April 10, 1916.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, Father of all Souls, never far from any of us, we would draw near to Thee, that our minds may be quickened, our hearts purified; that we may be strong to do and to dare. For Thou art the inspiration of all good, the strength of every noble endeavor. We realize that the path of duty is not always easy to follow; but we shall reap if we faint not, for Thou art the God of our salvation, and in Thee we put our trust. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 8, 1916, was read and approved.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of what is known as the juvenile-court bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the juvenile-court bill, the unfinished business on District day.

Mr. SPARKMAN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a preferential motion. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12193, the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida makes the preferential motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky) there were—ayes 46, noes 6.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fox River, Wis.: Continuing improvement from Depere up to Portage, including maintenance of improvement of Wolf River and of the harbors heretofore improved on Lake Winnebago, \$30,000. And the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to convey, by quitclaim deed, to the State of Wisconsin, or to the city of Portage, free of cost, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the "Portage Levee," including the right of way on which it is built, whenever the proper authorities of said State, or of said city, shall satisfy the Secretary of War that they are empowered by law to accept the same.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I dislike to question the competency or accuracy of the clerks employed by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and will say that the best compliment I have received in my work has come from the secretary of that committee, who praised the

accuracy of my deductions in the past, a task he is required constantly to verify.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] is an old member of the committee, but apparently knows little about actual commerce on any of the rivers or canals, as I have demonstrated. On page 6583 of the RECORD he contributes a statement prepared by Mr. McGann, whom he terms one of the capable clerks of the River and Harbor Committee, and the gentleman from North Carolina says he accepts it as absolutely correct.

I ask every Member who desires to ascertain the truth and learn how far we have been misled by so-called commerce statements to turn to the RECORD of April 8, page 6583, and read first the analysis of commerce on the Tennessee River, prepared by myself, and then the statement prepared by the gentleman from North Carolina, which appears in an adjoining column. I will rest my whole case against the committee and against the bill on that page.

One of the statements must be wrong, and I here verify my own figures and disprove the claims of the gentleman from North Carolina, whose other statements I have so frequently discredited by official reports.

This statement is of the utmost importance because of misleading commerce reports constantly quoted by engineers and waterway rainbow chasers when searching for large governmental appropriations:

Tennessee River above Chattanooga.

COMMERCIAL STATISTICS, 1914.

(Chief Army Engineer's Report, 1915, p. 2870.)

	Tons.
Total tons (carried 24 miles on the average).....	305,616
Logs.....	30,573
Lumber.....	8,510
Ties.....	18,850
Sand.....	145,832
Total	203,765

The logs, timber, and sand could have been floated in 2 or 3 feet depth without trouble.

I call upon the gentleman from North Carolina to explain his own error, as apparent from page 6583 of the RECORD.

Tennessee River between Chattanooga and Florence.
COMMERCIAL STATISTICS, 1914.
(Engineer's Report, 1915, p. 2871.)

	Tons.
Total tons (carried 42 miles on the average).....	128,872
Logs.....	16,746
Lumber.....	10,933
Ties.....	2,798
Sand.....	54,708
Total	85,185

Again I ask what excuse has the gentleman from North Carolina for the error he commits?

Tennessee River between Florence and Paducah.
COMMERCIAL STATISTICS, 1914.
(Chief Engineer's Report, 1915, p. 2872.)

	Tons.
Total tons.....	449,956
Logs.....	42,212
Lumber.....	12,261
Ties.....	330,376
Poles.....	20,000
Other timber.....	3,934
Total	408,783

Recapitulation.

	Total tons.	Net tons.
Above Chattanooga.....	305,616	101,851
Chattanooga to Florence.....	128,872	43,687
Florence to Paducah.....	449,956	41,173
Total	884,444	186,711

Only 186,711 tons, of which 78,000 tons was marble and cheap iron ore, floated from 5 to 15 miles. For this commerce we have already appropriated \$11,000,000, and this bill carries \$944,000 for the coming year.

Compared with this statement is the following from the gentleman from North Carolina, page 6583 of the RECORD:

"Now, the reports of the engineers show that for the calendar year 1914 there was a total commerce on the Tennessee River of 1,343,709 tons."

"Deducting floatable timber and sand, the commerce, as reported on the three sections of the river, is as follows: Above

Chattanooga, 134,446 tons; between Chattanooga and Florence, 68,732 tons; between Florence and Chattanooga, 268,791 tons; making a total of 471,969 tons."

	Tons.
Mr. SMALL says the total 1914 commerce was.....	1,343,709
Engineers' report, 1915, pages 2870 to 2872, shows.....	884,444

Excess over official report..... 559,265

Mr. SMALL's statement is over 60 per cent too high on total commerce.

	Tons.
Net commerce, Mr. SMALL's statement.....	471,969
Net commerce, engineers' report, pages 2870 to 2872.....	186,711

Excess over official report..... 285,258

Mr. SMALL's statement is 285,258 tons, or 250 per cent, too high on net tonnage. The importance of this comparison should not be overlooked. On pages 6178, 6179, and 6180 of the RECORD of April 3, the statements of the gentleman from North Carolina were squarely discredited by the official reports, and now he places responsibility upon a clerk for the inexcusable errors above noted. By getting the statements of inland-waterway boosters squarely on record, we are able to puncture misleading arguments, on which they are now securing enormous appropriations from the Government. In this connection I again call attention to the monstrous absurdity now perpetrated on the Government by the Beaufort-Norfolk waterway, which gets \$1,000,000 in this bill for a net commerce estimated at about 65,000 tons annually.

But the most scandalous part of that project is that the Government dredge crew can be employed for \$200,000 annually, whereas the \$800,000 additional for 1916 is divided up among private dredges, as exposed by Mr. GOOD, of Iowa, and these private contractors charge 80 per cent more for the same service than the cost to the Government when it performs the work with its own plant. These are the contracts made for us by Army engineers, and we are to blame for the extravagant appropriations they feel compelled to spend.

I do not allege graft in some \$300,000 overcharges on this one-year's job, provided for by an \$800,000 surplus in this one bill, but I do ask how far is the Government to be mulcted by such wasteful projects and such outrageous contracts.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe at this stage of the proceedings gentlemen ought to ask unanimous consent to proceed for so long a time as 15 minutes under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. FOSTER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard and the gentleman from Florida is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken up much of the time of this House, and I am indeed sorry the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] objects, not that any words of wisdom perhaps will fall from my lips, but in order that certain corrections may be made in remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], I have asked unanimous consent. It is not my purpose to attack those appropriations in this bill affecting the State of Wisconsin. I have studied those appropriations, and I believe they are worthy.

In a speech made before the House on war taxes and waste, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] took occasion to severely criticize several projects in my district which are provided for in the present rivers and harbors bill. Indeed, the gentleman took such a delight in this criticism that he referred to same on six different pages and at six different times.

Believing that these attacks are unfair and unjust, and that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin made said charges and criticisms because he was misinformed, and that there was no desire on his part to be unjust, I have decided, in justice to my State; my district, and my people, to briefly reply thereto and present to you for your consideration the facts.

On page 800 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 16, 1916, the gentleman referred to the St. Johns River, Fla., as follows:

St. Johns River, Fla., \$370,000, the full amount requested. Balance on hand January 1, 1915, \$111,381. Amount already expended, over \$6,500,000. Commerce is 40 per cent floatable lumber and ties. Florida projects are first in number and amount in all waterway bills. Florida also has first call at the hands of Army engineers. Why?

He also referred to the St. Johns River at various times during said speech for the purpose of proving to you that the rivers and harbors bill was nothing but a pork-barrel proposition.

In order that the Members may thoroughly understand this project, I desire briefly to give you the facts and figures relative

thereto as compiled by me from the report of the War Department, and in which I compare the St. Johns River, Fla., with the Fox River, Wis. I ask that you carefully study and compare them.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied the figures contained in comparisons Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, and also those contained in No. 5, which I will later give you, completely refutes—at least as far as my State is concerned—the statement that there is no commerce on the rivers and that the moneys spent on them by the Government is wasted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied any gentleman who will study the above figures will be compelled to admit there is no just grounds for placing these projects in the pork-barrel class. The Government has paid out on these projects the sum of \$6,758,170.59, less than \$1 per ton for the commerce carried over said projects, and from now on the cost to the Government will be materially decreased.

By referring to the Fox River, Wis., you will find the cost per ton to the Government has been something over \$9 per ton. It is with no spirit of criticism of the Fox River project that these comparisons are given, but solely to prove to you conclusively that the St. Johns River projects are worthy and are entitled to even more liberal appropriations than are given them by the Government. They also completely refute the inference made by my colleague when he stated, "Florida also has first call at the hands of the Army Engineers. Why?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I amend that and ask that he may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman's proceeding for 15 minutes, but it seems to me if we start this we can not deny the same privilege to others.

Mr. MANN. I think we will get along better if the gentleman's time is extended.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I regret I must decline to yield, as my time is limited.

Several of the distinguished gentlemen who have spoken against the rivers and harbors bill have stated they believe no assistance should be given by the Government until the projects receiving aid from the Government first receive some local assistance. While I do not entirely agree with this proposition, in addition to the statement made yesterday, when I showed Miami was spending \$585,000 on the Miami Harbor project, I desire to read to you from page 632, part 1, Report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, as follows:

Local cooperation. None is required by the appropriation act of June 25, 1910. Between 1892 and 1894 Duval County expended \$303,206.25 in building training walls and shore protection and dredging between Dames Point and Mile Point to secure an 18-foot channel through this 10-mile stretch. The funds were derived from the sale of county bonds issued for the purpose. The city of Jacksonville is now building a system of extensive, thoroughly modern municipal terminals, with adequate storage yards, warehouses, handling appliances, and rail connections, which will be ready for use about July 1, 1916. The cost is estimated at about \$1,500,000. The funds were raised by an issue of city bonds specially authorized for the purpose.

This should meet the opposition of my colleagues along the lines above mentioned.

COMPARISON No. 1.

St. Johns River, Fla.

Total expenditures on St. Johns River from Jacksonville, Fla., to sea have been to June 30, 1915, \$6,368,307.86.

The commerce was in—	Tons.	Value.
1912.....	2,204,794	\$67,877,603
1913.....	2,562,043	71,244,501
1914.....	2,186,678	60,718,452
Total for three years.....	6,953,515	199,840,556

Average value per ton, about \$30.

Passengers, 1,354,597.

N. B.—See page 632, annual report, on terminals. Balance in favor of above, 6,531,621 tons; value, \$197,642,662; 1,244,974 passengers.

FREIGHT TRAFFIC.

Articles.	Amount.		Valuation.
	Customary units.	Short tons.	
Cotton.....	24,320 bales.....	6,080	\$1,266,000
Cement.....	156,500 barrels.....	31,300	285,125
Coal.....	192,833 tons.....	192,833	867,750
Crushed stone.....	6,214 tons.....	6,214	18,642
Fertilizer material.....	133,555 tons.....	133,555	5,342,200
Fuller's earth and kaolin.....	18,189 tons.....	18,189	149,339
Grain and hay.....	662,760 packages.....	37,838	1,189,140
Groceries, etc.....	27,654 tons.....	27,654	2,533,700
Lumber and crossties.....	363,820,000 feet b. m.....	818,595	5,457,300
Miscellaneous.....	342,612 tons.....	342,612	27,884,960
Naval stores:			
Turpentine.....	58,123 barrels.....	12,940	1,409,238
Rosin.....	200,727 barrels.....	50,131	1,208,270
Oils:			
Refined.....	1,120,000 barrels.....	211,000	8,018,000
Crude.....	5,400,000 gallons.....	20,769	124,614
Creosote.....	28,509,000 gallons.....	126,666	2,733,320
Cotton seed.....	1,254 barrels.....	271	18,810
Oranges and fruit.....	686,495 boxes.....	27,447	940,616
Paving brick.....	4,200 tons.....	4,200	27,300
Phosphate.....	58,674 tons.....	58,674	293,370
Salt.....	39,000 tons.....	39,000	351,000
Vegetables.....	462,775 crates.....	20,251	616,718
Watermelons.....	38 cars.....	456	3,040
Total.....		2,183,678	60,718,452

Fox River, Wis.

Total expenditures on Fox River have been to June 30, 1915, \$3,911,651.18.

The commerce was in—	Tons.	Value.
1912.....	145,890	\$634,362
1913.....	134,638	724,972
1914.....	141,366	838,637
Total for three years.....	421,894	2,197,971

Average value per ton, about \$6.

Passengers, 89,623.

See attached statement.—Note sand, gravel, and wire grass. Over one-half the expenditures, about one-fifteenth the tonnage, one-ninety-eighth the value, and one-fourteenth the number of passengers.

FREIGHT TRAFFIC.

Articles.	Amount.		Valuation.	Average haul or distance freight was carried.	Rate per ton-mile.
	Customary units.	Short tons.			
Basswood bolts.....	152 cords.....	76	\$646	Miles. 42.5	\$0.0469
Beer.....	1,106 barrels.....	194	8,446	24.6	.0565
Brick.....	4,673,100.....	9,346	39,721	12.9	.0308
Building material.....	74.....	74	1,115	17.1	.0437
Butter and cheese.....	180.....	70,280	19.8	1008	
Cement.....	3,676 barrels.....	691	6,812	15.3	.058
Cinders.....	782 cubic yards.....	235	782	19.4	.0256
Coal.....	65,656.....	328,280	41.5	.0156	
Cordwood.....	1,046 cords.....	2,615	5,230	50.7	.0098
Clover seed.....	597 bushels.....	18	4,776	31.8	.0315
Fruit.....	10.....	250	12.1	.0823	
Fish.....	3.....	630	23.3	.0858	
Grain, flour, and feed.....	2,313.....	73,657	26.4	.0377	
Iron.....	33.....	652	16.1	.123	
Kerosene.....	21 barrels.....	4	84	25.9	.0192
Laths and shingles.....	1,884,000.....	269	7,807	24.9	.028
Lime.....	607 barrels.....	61	516	22.2	.045
Logs.....	1,397,300 feet.....	4,192	13,973	18.0	.0041
Lumber.....	1,220,500 feet b. m.....	1,831	36,615	26.4	.0303
Meat.....	34.....	6,165	24.7	.0809	
Merchandise, general.....	843.....	110,843	22.8	.0881	
Posts, cedar.....	2,200.....	33	110	44.3	.015
Potatoes.....	46,277 bushels.....	1,388	23,139	27.2	.0367
Pulp plaster.....	1,204 bags.....	60	753	21.8	.0457
Salt.....	1,124 barrels.....	157	1,236	36.4	.0196
Sand and gravel.....	34,495 cubic yards.....	46,568	1,236	36.4	.0196
Sugar.....	40 barrels.....	7	910	12.1	.047
Sugar beets.....	3,000.....	18,000	11.6	.0689	
Vinegar.....	43 barrels.....	8	258	17.4	.0312
Wire grass.....	1,467.....	21,735	32.1	.031	
Total.....		141,366	838,637		

COMPARISON No. 2.

St. Johns River, Fla.

The expenditures on St. Johns River from Jacksonville, Fla., to Palatka, Fla., to June 30, 1915, \$187,308.88.

The commerce was in—	Tons.	Value.
1912.....	206,441	\$8,601,264
1913.....	145,354	4,822,843
1914.....	141,892	3,620,415
Total for 3 years.....	493,687	17,044,522

Average value per ton, about \$25; passengers, 41,223.
Freight rates 50 per cent lower than localities that have no water competition.

FREIGHT TRAFFIC.

Articles.	Amount (customary units).	Amount in short tons.	Valua- tion.	Aver- age dis- tance carried.	Rate per ton- mile.
				Miles.	Cents.
Cattle.....	202 head.....	93	\$8,020	60	2.0
Cement.....	5,140 sacks.....	233	2,090	60	2.0
Coal.....	191 tons.....	191	1,170	60	2.0
Cottonseed meal.....	250 tons.....	250	7,750	60	1.7
Crate material.....	17,080 packages.....	433	13,345	60	2.0
Crossties.....	150,000 ties.....	12,500	45,000	60	4.0
Fertilizer.....	15,640 sacks.....	1,263	43,090	60	2.0
Fish.....	1,960 barrels.....	191	15,680	60	2.0
Grain and hay.....	60,549 packages.....	3,147	105,406	60	3.0
Grape fruit and oranges.....	163,671 boxes.....	6,453	213,841	60	5.0
Groceries, etc.....	11,908 packages.....	761	74,467	60	60
Lath, cypress.....	3,000,000.....	750	8,250	60	60
Logs:					
Cypress.....	300,000 feet b. m.....	1,200	3,600	10	60
Pine.....	9,949,000 feet b. m.....	33,247	91,700	10	60
Lumber:					
Cypress.....	10,800,000 feet b. m.....	18,900	302,400	60	60
Pine.....	7,500,000 feet b. m.....	18,000	100,000	60	5.0
Miscellaneous.....	36,819 tons.....	36,819	2,345,724	60	2.1
Naval stores.....	12,710 barrels.....	3,109	130,432	60	3.0
Pears.....	1,344 barrels.....	134	5,376	60	25
Poles.....	556.....	140	1,500	60	3.0
Potatoes.....	37,152 barrels.....	3,440	83,592	60	60
Shingles, cypress.....	1,000,000.....	250	8,250	60	3.0
Vegetables.....	11,683 packages.....	388	14,732	60	60
Total.....		141,892	3,620,415		

Fox River, Wis.

Total expenditures on Fox River to June 30, 1915, \$3,911,651.18.

The commerce was in—	Tons.	Value.
1912.....	145,890	\$634,362
1913.....	134,638	724,972
1914.....	141,366	838,637
Total for 3 years.....	421,894	2,197,971

Average value per ton, about \$6; passengers, 89,623.

COMPARISON.

Tonnage, about equal.
Value in favor of St. Johns River, \$14,846,551.
Expenditures, about one-twentieth of Fox River.
Passengers, about one-half of Fox River.

COMPARISON No. 3.

St. Johns River, Fla.

Total expenditures on St. Johns River from Palatka, Fla., to Lake Harney, Fla., to June 30, 1915, \$187,308.88.

The commerce was in—	Tons.	Value.
1912.....	212,121	\$4,858,338
1913.....	174,045	3,549,662
1914.....	163,209	3,058,117
Total for three years.....	549,375	11,466,117

Average value about \$20 per ton; passengers, 35,823.
Freight rates 50 per cent lower than localities that have no water competition.

FREIGHT TRAFFIC.

Articles.	Amount (customary units).	Amount in short tons.	Valua- tion.	Aver- age dis- tance carried.	Rate per ton- mile.
				Miles.	Cents.
Cattle.....	183 head.....	86	\$7,320	142	1.1
Cement.....	5,140 sacks.....	283	2,540	142	7
Coal.....	179 tons.....	179	1,098	142	7
Cottonseed meal.....	250 tons.....	250	7,750	87	2.5
Crate material.....	16,636 packages.....	402	8,889	142	6
Fertilizer.....	13,127 sacks.....	1,095	36,323	142	7
Fish.....	2,975 barrels.....	302	28,910	(1)	1.2
Grain and hay.....	61,119 sacks.....	3,444	105,788	(1)	2.1
Grapefruit and oranges.....	139,175 boxes.....	5,884	194,712	142	3.1
Groceries.....	287 tons.....	287	25,765	142	(1)
Ice.....	713 tons.....	713	4,842	(1)	50
Logs:					
Cypress.....	16,627,000 feet b. m.....	66,481	199,740	50	50
Pine.....	18,951,000 feet b. m.....	57,353	182,537	50	(1)
Lumber.....	90,000 feet b. m.....	194	1,332	(1)	3.1
Miscellaneous.....	24,436 tons.....	24,436	2,179,522	142	2.8
Naval stores.....	5,462 barrels.....	1,240	54,837	142	2.8
Vegetables.....	13,617 packages.....	580	16,232	142	60
Total.....		163,209	3,058,117		

COMPARISON.

Tonnage greater than Fox River by 127,481.
Value greater than Fox River by \$9,268,146.
Expenditures about one-twentieth of Fox River.
Passengers about 55 per cent less than Fox River.
NOTE.—Not in a spirit of criticism, but solely because the gentleman takes a special delight in ridiculing the commerce on all projects where a large part of same is lumber, logs, sand, and gravel, I ask you to refer to comparison No. 1. There you will find, under heading "Freight traffic," coal, 65,656 tons; sand and gravel, 46,568 tons; and wire grass, 1,467 tons; a total of 113,691 tons out of a total of all articles of commerce of only 141,366 tons for year 1914.

COMPARISON No. 4.

*St. Johns River, Lake Harney to the sea.**Fox River.*

Tonnage, 1912-1914, inclusive.....	7,996,577
Value, 1912-1914, inclusive.....	\$226,153,301
Passengers, 1912-1914, inclusive.....	1,411,643
Total expenditures.....	\$6,758,170.59

Tonnage, 1912-1914, inclusive.....	421,894
Value, 1912-1914, inclusive.....	\$2,197,971
Passengers, 1912-1914, inclusive.....	89,623
Total expenditures.....	\$3,911,651.18

COMPARISON.

St. Johns River, with less than twice the expenditures of Fox River—
 Carried more than 15 times the tonnage of the Fox River.
 Carried more than 112 times the value of the Fox River.
 Carried more than 15 times the passengers of the Fox River.

NOTE.—The three St. Johns projects are combined, as they are really one, and besides, the gentleman in his speech combined the expenditures on same.

COMPARISON No. 5.

*Kissimmee River, Fla.**Fox River, Wis.*

Total expenditures on Kissimmee River, Fla., to June 30, 1915,
 \$32,266.16.

Total expenditures on Fox River, to June 30, 1915, \$3,911,651.18.

The commerce was in—	Tons.	Value.
1912.....	71,950	\$2,930,500
1913.....	85,550	3,558,400
1914.....	36,902	828,890
Total for three years.....	194,402	7,317,790

The commerce was in—	Tons.	Value.
1912.....	145,890	\$634,362
1913.....	134,638	724,972
1914.....	141,366	838,637
Total for three years.....	421,894	2,197,971

Average value per ton in 1913, about \$40; average value per ton in
 1914, about \$23; passengers, 5,000.

NOTE.—I believe you will concede the above is a very good showing
 for a river which, according to the gentleman from Wisconsin, is dry
 8 or 9 months out of 12.

Average value per ton, about \$6; passengers, 89,623.

FREIGHT TRAFFIC.

Articles.	Amount (customary units).	Amount in short tons.	Valua- tion.	Aver- agedis- tance carried.	Rate per ton- mille.
				Miles.	Cents.
Cattle.....	600 head.....	140	\$12,000	12	20.0
Crate material.....	37,500 packages.....	750	18,000	12	20.0
Cross ties.....	9,000 ties.....	630	3,600	12	20.0
Fertilizer.....	4,000 sacks.....	400	12,000	12	20.0
Fish.....	5,000 barrels.....	500	40,000	20	20.0
Gasoline and oils.....	1,000 barrels.....	207	8,640	12	20.0
Grain and hay.....	15,000 packages.....	750	22,500	12	20.0
Grapefruit and oranges.....	63,750 boxes.....	2,550	63,750	12	20.0
Groceries, etc.....	1,000 tons.....	1,000	400,000	12	20.0
Hides and skins.....	25 tons.....	25	2,000	12	20.0
Ice.....	600 tons.....	600	4,800	20	20.0
Logs, pine.....	1,400,000 feet b. m.....	4,900	9,000	12	20.0
Lumber, pine.....	7,050,000 feet b. m.....	15,800	85,000	12	20.0
Miscellaneous.....	1,500 tons.....	1,500	50,000	12	20.0
Naval stores:					
Turpentine.....	700 barrels.....	155	13,950	30	7.5
Rosin.....	2,400 barrels.....	600	18,000	30	7.5
Railroad supplies.....	100 tons.....	100	2,500	12	20.0
Sand.....	200 tons.....	200	200	20	20.0
Vegetables.....	40,000 boxes.....	1,000	50,000	12	20.0
Wood.....	3,000 cords.....	5,085	7,950	12	20.0
Wool.....	80 packs.....	10	5,000	12	20.0
Total.....		36,902	\$28,890		

COMPARISON.

Tonnage in favor of Fox River, 227,492.
 Value in favor of Kissimmee River, \$5,119,819.
 Expenditures, about one one-hundred-and-twentieth of Fox River.
 Passengers, about one-eighteenth of Fox River.

The word "why" in the statement can only refer to the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I can not, however, bring myself to believe the gentleman from Wisconsin intended to cast any reflection on the chairman of said committee. I will, therefore, only say that his 21 years of faithful service in this House is too well known to need any defense at my hands.

I also find, in referring to the speech of the able but misguided gentleman, that he severely criticized the Kissimmee River project; and while this is a small project, small only from an appropriation standpoint, he took occasion to go out of his way and unjustly criticize same on four pages and at four different times. I believe that the gentleman, as stated relative to the St. Johns River proposition, also made these unjust criticisms because he was misinformed. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR], referring to the Trinity River project, on page 1135 of the RECORD, above referred to, said:

Is not that a case like the Kissimmee River, in Florida, that ought to be insured against fire?

And on page 1148 of the same RECORD he referred to the Kissimmee River project in part as follows:

The country has been informed that the official engineer's report is untrue when it says the Kissimmee River is dry eight months of the year. What is the difference, provided the engineers approve Kissimmee River, wet or dry? The issue of wet or dry on the Kissimmee has become as famous as wet or dry Kansas, and has become a prolific source of argument; but so is the condition of the Trinity, which is dry eight or nine months of the year, according to the same authority.

Yet Army engineers recommend an expenditure on the Trinity of twenty millions or thereabouts, although it is reported dry two-thirds of the time. Why not insure against fire?

On page 833 of the same RECORD he made the following statement:

A vigorous champion of the Kissimmee River, eight months dry during the year, according to engineer's report, was also eloquently impressed.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I desire to present to you some figures which I have compiled from the records of the War Department, and I am satisfied, if you will carefully study these figures, you will agree with me that these criticisms are unjust, the facts do not sustain them, and the same should not have been made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I am satisfied in the future no similar charges as these will be made by him or anyone.

I also desire to call your attention to the fact that on the Chippewa River, Wis., the Government has spent \$201,756; and by referring to the report of the Army engineers you will find the river traffic at present on said river is confined to rafting of manufactured lumber and the running of loose logs, and that the maximum draft that can be carried at low water is 18 inches.

I also desire to call your attention to the St. Croix River, part in Wisconsin and part in Minnesota, on which the Government has spent \$156,487.34. The commerce on said river, as shown by the 1915 report of the Chief of Engineers, was only 42,835 tons, and the same was composed largely of logs and lumber, a

larger part of which was floated; in fact, about 75 per cent of the commerce was logs and lumber.

When I state to you that in 1914, on account of the very dry seasons in our State, which practically made it impossible for river navigation on the Kissimmee River, the commerce on said river was 36,902 tons, with a value of \$828,890, I believe you will agree with me that the Kissimmee River project is not only a worthy one, but that the total expenditure by the Government of \$32,266.16 on said project, when compared with the appropriation of the St. Croix River of \$156,487.34, with a tonnage of only 42,335 tons for the year 1914, fades into insignificance.

I also believe, Mr. Chairman, if it had not been the policy of the committee at the present time not to include any new projects, that the paltry appropriation of \$47,000 which we are asking for the Kissimmee River, and which will give us continuous navigation, would be granted by the Members of this House at this time.

For 34 years I have lived at Kissimmee, on the shores of Lake Tohopekaliga, and I therefore believe I know and understand conditions there. Therefore, in order that my colleagues may more fully appreciate the unjust attack made on said river, I will briefly describe for what purpose the appropriation of \$32,266.15 was spent and what the appropriation of \$3,000 is to cover. Originally the Kissimmee River was only a short stream, but by a system of canals cut by private parties and without expense to the Government the distance now covered by said appropriation is approximately 137 miles, or from Kissimmee to Lake Okechobee.

As a matter of fact, my friends, if you would give us the appropriation sufficient to construct the necessary locks, instead of having navigation eight or nine months out of the year, and sometimes throughout the entire year when we have the usual amount of rainfall, we would have navigation the year round. In order that you may thoroughly understand the project I will briefly describe same. You can take the boat at Kissimmee, cross Lake Tohopekaliga, a distance of 13 miles, then through the Southport Canal into Lake Cypress, across Lake Cypress, and through a canal into Lake Hatchineha; then through a system of canals and the old river into Lake Kissimmee, and across said lake, where you reach the Kissimmee River proper; then down said river to Lake Okechobee, one of the largest inland lakes in the world, and then through Caloosahatchee River to the Gulf, or if you prefer through a system of canals constructed by the State without expense to the Government, and for the purpose of draining the Everglades, you can reach Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach, Miami, and the ocean; or you can go northward to Jacksonville. Yet, by asking the Government for \$47,000 to give us 12 months' instead of a possible eight or nine months' navigation is only to be accused of being a persistent and consistent follower of the pork-barrel system.

But why take up more of your time with these facts and figures. The charges and imputations have been fully refuted. I will only say, Mr. Chairman, that Jacksonville, with her approximately, 100,000 good, true, loyal, and patriotic citizens; the picturesque St. Johns winding her way northward from Sanford to Palatka, and from Palatka to Jacksonville; the Indian River with her scenic beauty; and the Kissimmee River with her sweet-sounding euphonic Indian name needs no further defense at my hands. If, however, a further defense should be needed I only have to state to you that during the winter season just coming to a close more than 100,000 tourists from the North, East, West, and South have basked in the balmy sunshine of Florida; have bathed in her placid waters during the months of January, February, and March, and for the past few months having, in truth and in fact, escaped the cold and chilling blasts of the north, and having really lived the life worth living, will now wend their way homeward, only to sing the praises of the wonderful resources and possibilities of my State and the hospitality of her people. [Applause.]

Permit me briefly to quote you What We Believe, written by Dr. Lincoln Hulley, president of Stetson University, De Land, Fla.:

We believe in Florida, the land of blue skies and soft winds and eternal sunshine.

We love its rivers, lakes, pine woods, orange groves, and broad stretches of prairie.

We are one with her people to unite heart, soul, and body in developing her resources, in making this the beautiful home of a free and prosperous people.

We vow with them to be true to the ideals of the sturdy settlers who opened this fair land to be a home for all people.

We invite those seeking new homes, if they are worthy, to settle among us, and we pledge to them the warm hand of hospitality, a glad welcome to the State, and a fraternal cooperation in seeking peace and happiness in this land of plenty—a land of summer and sunshine and song.

I also quote The Floridian's Creed and Covenant, by William Fremont Blackman, Ph. D., LL. D., former president of

Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., which is as follows, and ask that it be included in my remarks:

I believe in Florida, land of the open and fathomless sky, of lambent stars, of mountainous opalescent clouds, of soft benignant airs, of inebriant summer, of unstinted and vivifying sunshine, of responsive and fecund soil.

I believe in Florida, laved on every hand—cooled and warmed and cleansed and fed and decorated—by the azure and teeming waters of Tropic seas and by countless and sparkling lakes and streams.

I believe in Florida, land of wide-stretching and open woods, of limitless green prairies and glades, of dense and vine-hung hammocks, of mysterious bays and swamps, all in their various forms lovely and fruitful; the land of fragrant pine and mourning cypress, of moss-draped oak, of waxen magnolia, of comely palm, of regal poinciana, of flaming vine, and of shy and brilliant orchid.

I believe in Florida, land of the orange and pomelo and spicy kumquat, of peach and pear and persimmon and loquat, of pineapple and guava and mango and avocado, of corn and cotton and cane and cattle, and of whatever else is anywhere borne of trees or grown by the soil of the earth.

I believe in Florida, the home of creatures strange, curious, and beautiful—the saurian monster; the gliding reptile; the darting, dainty lizard; the aquatic manatee; the egret in snowy nuptial array; the roseate spoonbill; the exuberant mockingbird; the flame-like, flute-like cardinal; the woodpecker with ivory bill and the hummingbird with ruby throat; the painted butterfly sipping nectar in winter days.

I believe in Florida, land of romantic legend and adventurous history, of towns the most ancient and the newest, of swiftly-growing cities, of farms and orchards, and of wide and inviting solitudes still awaiting man's coming.

I believe in Florida, magnet and meeting place for men and women of the North and the South, the East and the West, and countries overseas—Americans all, one blended and indissoluble and free people. I believe in her eager boys and winsome girls, in her schools and colleges, in her churches of diverse faiths, in her institutions of philanthropy and mercy, and in her press, the voice and the instructor of her common mind and will.

In fine, I believe in Florida, the Commonwealth old yet young, unformed as yet, but palpitant with energy and faltering forth into the future with high hope and swift step; and believing thus—

I covenant with all her people of like faith to give myself to her service, mind and heart and hand and purse, to explore and develop her hidden resources, to celebrate her praises truthfully, to win worthy citizens for her void spaces, to till her fields, to keep pure her politics, to make more efficient her schools, to strengthen and unify her churches, to cleanse and sweeten her social life, and thus to make her in full fact what she is by human right and divine dower, the queen of Commonwealths.

Neither of these gentlemen are Floridians by birth, only by adoption; both of them are from States north of the Mason and Dixon line; but no one, after reading their sentiments expressed as above, would ever doubt their loyalty to their adopted State.

Mr. Chairman, we should not too severely criticize the gentleman from Wisconsin. He is not entirely to blame, as he has worked so hard on the bill which was reported last year and the present bill under consideration he is suffering from a severe attack of riveritis and harboritis. His case is not, however, dangerous, and I am satisfied if he will pay my State a visit this fall and secure a few facts he will at least recover, so far as my projects are concerned. I now take pleasure in extending to him a cordial invitation, and assure him he will receive a cordial reception.

Now, Mr. Chairman, not being satisfied with criticizing the projects in my State and other projects in the South, the distinguished gentleman diverted his remarks and engaged in an attack upon the South as a whole. On page 1140 of the above Record referred to he called attention to the number of southern Members holding chairmanships of important committees, and severely criticized the same, as follows:

SOUTHERN DELEGATION WITH 27 CHAIRMEN.

The country is confronted with a remarkable spectacle when chairmen from Southern States sit in judgment over the deliberations of 27 of the most important committees of the House, and when a large majority of the Democratic majority controlling national legislation hail from these same Southern States; but when to this astonishing situation the country is further informed by the committee chairman that southern leaders and southern delegations will be lined up behind such scandalous raids on the Treasury it is a call for sectionalism that will bear fruit in no uncertain manner.

In reply to the above I will only say, Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen referred to do not owe their high standing in Congress to chance, and same is due solely in recognition of their ability, character, and long service.

I desire to state a large percentage of my constituents were formerly your constituents, but they are now, regardless of the State or section they formerly lived in, Floridians, loyal and true, and it is unfair to them to raise the cry of sectionalism. And to do so, Mr. Chairman, is only to criticize those, many of whom were but recently constituents of yours, but I am glad to say now are constituents of mine.

In order that you may thoroughly understand how rapidly my district is growing it is only necessary for me to remind you that approximately six years ago at St. Cloud, Fla., what is now known as the "Wonder City," there was only one house, while to-day there are approximately 3,000 citizens, happy and contented. In this short time they have built blocks of handsome brick business houses, beautiful homes, an ice factory, a three-

story brick hotel, and have banks, electric lights, telephone, cement sidewalks, and paved streets. Fully 80 per cent of these people moved to my district from States north of the Mason-Dixon Line, and you only have to write any of them to find out whether or not the lines dividing the North and the South have been swept aside. A few years ago the Grand Army of the Republic met in my home town, and I never saw a more beautiful sight than the one presented when the old soldiers wearing the blue marched down our principal street, and by their side marched those wearing the gray. As they marched down the street our local band played "Dixie," and before the last note died away one of the old and few life and drum corps of the days of '61 to '65 took up the strains of "Yankee Doodle." On that occasion, Mr. Chairman, it was my pleasure to deliver the address of welcome, and as I, a southerner and son of a Confederate soldier, clasped the hand of the commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, a veteran of the Civil War, it was my pleasure to remark, in truth and in fact, "There is no North, no South, no East, no West." [Applause.]

I could also call your attention to the growth of Okeechobee City, on Lake Okeechobee, and in fact many other places in my district, where the growth has been equally as marvelous and wonderful, but time will not permit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote on all bills as my conscience dictates, and I shall never vote against a proposition because it does not directly or indirectly affect my district, and because no benefits for my district will be derived therefrom. I also trust, in the future, when any gentleman desires to make an attack on any proposition he will name the State, and that he will not unjustly criticize either the South or the North.

I am sorry to have taken up so much of your time, but you can rest assured I shall never let my State be unjustly criticized without defending her to the extent of my ability.

I will simply say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I trust as long as I sit as a Member, or perchance as a spectator, in the Halls of Congress, no more will I hear the cry of the North and the South in a partisan manner, as that day has passed forever, and we are now one people, with one flag; a united Nation with only one purpose in view, "On earth peace, good will toward men." I thank you. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.: For maintenance, \$43,000.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

This item of \$43,000 for the maintenance of the Superior-Duluth Harbor is an item for a port that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] and I have the honor to jointly represent. I speak upon this item not for the purpose of justifying it, because it needs no justification, but there have been intimations thrown out on this floor from time to time that if a Member was silent with reference to a project in his own State he was inconsistent when he voted against a project in some other State.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to this item for the purpose of showing some of our friends what commerce really is and what justification there is for Members remaining silent upon some of these propositions and not upon others. The Superior-Duluth Harbor last year—and I read from the report of the Board of Engineers—did the following business:

The total number of tons received and shipped for the calendar year 1914 was 33,535,701 tons—

Mark the figures—
with a total valuation of \$287,200,960.

It is the largest interior port in the United States and second only to New York City in the United States. The total number of vessels arriving and departing was 9,712. Net registered tonnage of all vessels arriving and departing, 28,216,139 tons. The average number of tons of cargo received per day during the season of navigation for 1914 was 45,176. The average number of tons shipped per day for same period was 97,528. In other words, the commerce of our port was 143,000 tons per day, three times as much as most of the smaller items in this bill for the entire year. In other words, we ship more in a single day than the majority of the rivers in this country ship during an entire year.

I read further:

The harbor has iron-ore docks with a total storage capacity of 797,592 gross tons, coal docks with total capacity of 10,908,000 short tons, and grain elevators with total capacity of 31,625,000 bushels, and these freight-handling facilities are being increased annually. From a total of 6,325,351 tons of freight shipped and received in 1895 the commerce has increased to 33,535,704 tons shipped and received in 1914. From the curve of increase shown in the harbor commerce, and with a knowledge of the sources of supply which create this traffic, it is believed that the prospective commercial importance of this harbor is very great and that any reasonable necessary aid to insure the safety of vessels using it would be fully justified.

From the report of the committee upon this bill, containing an extract from the report of the Board of Engineers, I read:

From comparison with the rate on freight passing through St. Marys Falls Canal with railroad rates the saving through water transportation appears to be \$2 per ton, and for the 33,535,704 tons received and shipped at this harbor in 1914 amounts to \$67,071,408.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. In other words, the saving by reason of this water commerce from the port alone was \$67,000,000 last year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have a very congested condition in this harbor. In the last river and harbor bill I secured the incorporation of an item for a survey to increase the anchorage basin and turning area. A favorable report was made on this project. It is now pending before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, recommending the adoption of a project at a total cost of \$360,000, and an immediate appropriation of \$180,000. It is a matter of urgency and a matter of necessity. But, having in mind the rule that the committee adopted when they began the consideration of this bill, having in mind the condition of the Treasury, I did not even ask the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to consider this very necessary item, because I believe that in view of the present condition of the Treasury the committee was warranted in keeping out all new projects except those that were absolutely necessary, and I supposed that in the make-up of the bill which the committee would bring in they would have the same thing in mind; that they would bring in a bill carrying appropriations only for the maintenance of existing rivers and harbors in order to carry the commerce that now floats upon them, and in addition carrying only appropriations for existing projects whereby, if they failed to carry on the work, there would be a vast loss to the Government in the projects that have already been adopted.

But I find when I come to an examination of this bill that there is nothing of that kind; no such rule has been adopted. I venture to say that at least half of the appropriations in this present bill could be dispensed with without interfering with the maintenance with a single river and harbor where it ought to be maintained or without the Government losing a dollar in the carrying on of existing projects. I had supposed that the House would treat this river and harbor bill upon that basis, having in mind the condition of the Treasury; but that is not so. We find throughout this bill the argument is not its present necessity, but whether it is carrying out an existing project and whether in the future, however distant it may be, that the expenditure is warranted.

I have tried on two or three occasions and have taken the floor to attempt to get such items stricken out, upon the theory alone of the present condition of the Treasury; but I have been unsuccessful in that. And I want to say that when we come to the question of the extravagance of this administration, in view of the present condition of the Treasury, in view of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is lying awake nights to find where he is going to get the revenue to supply the appropriations that are being made, I assert some of the items in this bill are absolutely unjustified; and if some of the items remain in the bill there are tenfold more reasons for including some new projects such as are contained in the report, as, for example, that with reference to my own harbor, where the necessity is tenfold greater than the necessity for some of the appropriations that are contained in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, new projects were not left out of this bill for the reason that none of them were urgent or important. The gentleman's project was not before us at the time we were framing this bill, but if it had been it would have fallen outside of the rule established, not to include new projects in this bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to say that I am not criticizing the gentleman at all, or his committee, for not including this project. I did not ask them to do so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman had been with us when we were framing this bill, he would have had, I think; in fact, I am sure he would have had more information than he has now; at least, more than he seems to have when he says there are many projects in this bill that could have been left out without any loss to the Government.

In that he is badly mistaken. There are very few projects in this bill which, in my judgment, could have been left out without loss to the Government.

Now, there may be some items here and there where no great amount of damage perhaps would be done, but not many; if any such there are now, we were confronted with this condition; We found \$230,000,000 of projects on the books to be taken care of if they are to be completed, and one of the reasons for leaving out new projects was that we might deal more liberally with these old projects and get them out of the way, as far as possible in this bill. Of course, another reason was the condition of the Treasury and the necessity for national preparedness. We considered all those things. But if we had taken on these new projects we could not have carried forward this old work as rapidly as was desired, nor have dealt with them as liberally as we have.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I, for one, propose to try to have new projects placed in the next bill. I stated here the other day that after this bill is out of the way and disposed of by the House I propose to ask the committee to come together for the purpose of considering new projects, of having hearings upon them, and to prepare the bill, in so far as new projects are concerned, before this session ends; that is, as far as we can prepare it.

Now, as I have just remarked, we want to get this old work pushed along as rapidly as we can. You will see that with \$230,000,000 of projects and only about \$40,000,000 in this bill how long it is going to take us to care for all these old projects. Of course, if the Flood Control Committee takes care of the building of the levees on the Mississippi River, that is going to eliminate a part of our work, and we can perhaps get along more rapidly. Now, the gentleman [Mr. LENROOT] has a project that is a very important one. I have been there and I know what his harbor is. There is not a more important inland harbor in the whole country than his, and I think it not only worthy but urgent, and as soon as we have a bill with new projects in it I think that will be taken care of. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Calumet River, Ill. and Ind.: For maintenance, \$20,000: *Provided*, That the upper limit of said project shall be at the intersection of the Grand Calumet River and the Indiana Harbor Canal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Reference is made here to the Indiana Harbor Canal. I wish some one who is informed would describe that canal.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman that it is an artificial waterway running in from the lake to the interior to reach a lot of manufacturing plants. It was built by private enterprise, as I understand, to begin with, and at private expense. They turned it over to the Government of the United States, which is now appropriating money out of the Treasury to build breakwaters to protect it from storms.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did the Government make any expenditure for the acquisition of this canal?

Mr. MADDEN. None whatever.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It was donated by the owners?

Mr. MADDEN. Donated by the owners.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And it runs up to private establishments?

Mr. MADDEN. It runs into the interior from the lake several miles, and is capable of carrying ships up to these manufacturing plants.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does it make a connection between the lake and the Illinois River?

Mr. MADDEN. No; it is just a harbor.

Mr. MANN. The Indiana Harbor Canal runs from Lake Michigan to Indiana Harbor and intersects the Grand Calumet River.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But there is an artificial canal?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And it has been taken over by the Government?

Mr. MANN. I do not remember whether the Government has taken it over or not.

Mr. MADDEN. It was taken over in an appropriation bill several years ago.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is for the maintenance of an artificial canal?

Mr. MANN. This appropriation is for the maintenance of the Calumet River. It has nothing to do with the maintenance of the Indiana Harbor Canal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of what benefit would the river be to these manufacturers, these industries along the banks, if it were not for the canal leading into the river?

Mr. MANN. The river and the canal have nothing to do with each other, except that they meet. One is on one section of the triangle and the other is on the other.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It provides transportation inland, does it not?

Mr. MANN. This provision in the bill has nothing to do with the Indiana Harbor Canal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does it not make a connection with the lake?

Mr. MANN. The Indiana Harbor Canal runs to the lake, but the Calumet River at this point is not navigable at this time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The purpose is to make it navigable, is it not?

Mr. MANN. The project for the Grand Calumet River provides for its extension one-half mile above Hammond, Ind. Now, you might think it was easily ascertainable where one-half mile above Hammond, Ind., is, but nobody knows or ever has known just what that meant; whether it meant one-half mile above the eastern boundary of Hammond, Ind., or one-half mile above the center line of Hammond, Ind., or one-half mile beyond the western boundary. The engineers have desired that it shall be determined exactly where the upper limit of the project is, and, on their recommendation, it was fixed at the junction with the Indiana Harbor Canal. However, there is no appropriation for the improvement of the Grand Calumet River up to that point, and none is being asked for at this time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman that I have no objection to the item.

Mr. MANN. I understand that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am only trying to ascertain just what connection the canal has with this project.

Mr. MANN. The canal runs from the lake to Indiana Harbor. It is an artificial canal. There are manufacturing plants along there. The Grand Calumet River comes around the other way, and the two are connected, but there is no commerce that runs around through the two. This is just fixing the upper limit of the Calumet River project.

Mr. MADDEN. This was all built by private enterprise.

Mr. MANN. The Indiana Harbor Canal has nothing to do with anything in this item.

Mr. MADDEN. It is to build a breakwater.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is looking at the wrong item.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no disposition to oppose the item.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I understand this discussion, it is with reference to the item in lines 16 to 19, inclusive, for the Calumet River. Is that correct?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought the gentleman was asking about Indiana Harbor.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. There are very often controversies here as to the effect of the improvement of rivers and harbors. The part of the Calumet River that is in Illinois, or a portion of the part of it that is in Illinois, is in my district. The major part of the Calumet River is in my district. We have been making improvements for several years, which are now practically completed. I hear gentlemen talk here about commerce to the extent of thousands of tons, and some to the extent of hundreds of thousands of tons. The Calumet River has a commerce of six million to eight million or ten million tons every year, and does not take very much trouble to boast about it. We hear a great deal about the commerce of Chicago. Calumet Harbor is in Chicago. The Chicago River now has a commerce of three or four million tons a year. Calumet Harbor itself had a commerce last year of something over 7,000,000 tons. During the more prosperous times a few years ago it went up to 8,000,000 tons, and then it dropped down again.

A large share, it is true, is iron ore; but a large share also is grain and other heavy commodities.

If any harbor improvement has ever demonstrated the benefit of making improvements in advance of the commerce it has been demonstrated at South Chicago on the Calumet River, for as fast as the river has been deepened so as to make it navigable, it has been lined with great establishments carrying on a great commerce.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That has been done in anticipation of business at that point?

Mr. MANN. Much has been done; yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. With reference to this improvement, it can not be claimed for the Calumet River, or South Chicago, that it was wholly responsible for the heavy tonnage to which the gentleman refers. That tonnage is caused by the development of business elsewhere and the distribution of resources throughout the country.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly the Calumet River is so located that it is within touch of commerce coming into Chicago. Owing to the many difficulties or obstructions in the Chicago River, lake navigation from South Chicago is for grain about 50 cents a ton cheaper than from the Chicago River, and the heavy commerce naturally has a tendency to go down by way of South Chicago to Calumet River; it is through commerce.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is an extensive lake tonnage centralized at this point?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That passes on to Cleveland, Toledo, Erie, and Buffalo?

Mr. MANN. Yes; the Calumet River commerce radiates to all points on the lake.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And in its course it would pass through such connecting waterways as the Great Lakes to the East?

Mr. MANN. I do not think anybody would be foolish enough, if that is what the gentleman wants my opinion about, to send commerce from the Calumet River for the purpose of going through the Beaufort inland canal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman will admit that iron ore is not perishable and that coal is not perishable.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; iron is perishable. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, among the criticisms of this bill there is an occasional expression directed against that really national project, the Norfolk and Beaufort Inlet waterway. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] appears on the scene at intervals and endeavors to indulge in ribald jests about that very important project.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the project the gentleman referred to?

Mr. SMALL. The Norfolk and Beaufort Inlet waterway. Yesterday I received a letter from a man who appears to be the chief boatswain in charge of one of the United States steamers, owned by the Bureau of Fisheries and now located at Wilmington, N. C., on Cape Fear, and I wish to read the letter. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF FISHERIES,
Wilmington, N. C., April 7, 1916.

Hon. JOHN H. SMALL, M. C.,

The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Having read an account in the Wilmington (N. C.) Star of your speech in the House in re the appropriation for inland waterway—Norfolk to Beaufort—I feel constrained to address a few lines to you on the question.

I am in command of this vessel, which belongs to the United States Fish Commission, at present on the Cape Fear River, engaged in the propagation of shad. We came down via the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal two weeks ago.

This vessel is 37 years old, and owing to the fact that she has the same engines now that she started with in 1879, and that she has had practically no repairs to her hull since 1896, it is considered too great a risk to send her to sea by the outside route around Cape Hatteras. Therefore, for the last five or six years whenever she is ordered south we always have to use the inland waterways; and, as we have twin screws, it becomes necessary to have a tug tow us through from Norfolk to the North River Light. With our draft of 9 feet and with the shallow depth of water through the North Landing River, we would be in danger of breaking our propellers on stumps, sunken logs, etc., which would not be the case if the whole route were deepened to 12 feet, as the bill provides for.

I also wish to cite the fact that all the way across Croatan Sound this vessel dragged over the bottom, just being able to barely slide over, and in two places in Adams Creek we also stuck.

I do not know just how much traffic there is, but I do know this, that if the entire route is deepened to 12 feet and later to 15 feet it would be the greatest boon to all maritime interests and a blessing to us fellows who handle ships. And as you so aptly say, "We could send our submarines, torpedo vessels, tugs, and small gunboats via that route, thus saving time, expense, and worry to the naval authorities."

There may be waste in the rivers and harbors bill, but it is not in any part of it which improves waters in this section. I am telling you this as a man who has served 30 years in the United States Navy, and several years previous to that in Maine merchantmen and New Bedford whalers. Being a native of Massachusetts, no one can honestly accuse me of being partial to North Carolina. I simply want to give credit where credit is due, and it is due your section.

If this will be of any assistance to you, you are at liberty to use it, providing you withhold my name, as the Navy Department would not approve of my writing this.

Sincerely hoping you win out in your fight for a good cause, I remain,

It is for that reason that I do not give his name.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Illinois River, Ill.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance below Copperas Creek, \$55,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to say a few words about the tonnage situation. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] made a speech, eloquent, as usual, about the large tonnage at his port of Superior. It is entirely commendable to that port and that section of the country, but the argument as he makes it is very much the same as we sometimes make along the Atlantic seaboard, where we speak of the revenue derived at our ports. At New York we take in the largest amount of customs duties of any port in the United States, more than at all ports combined. At Philadelphia we take in \$20,000,000, which is more than the Government has given us back in all time for the improvement of the river. Gentlemen rise and say that we have no right to state those figures, because business does not originate with us, because that \$20,000,000 revenue at Philadelphia is paid for by the people of the country.

Now, if we accept that as the true line of argument, we have to apply it to the argument made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] as to the tonnage of his port and to the increased tonnage of the Calumet River referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The truth of the matter is—and it scarcely seems necessary to reiterate it—we are interdependent in all these matters. There would be no great business at Philadelphia if there was not a hinterland. There would be no great business at New York if there was not a country to fall back on, and the same argument applies to Duluth, to Superior, to Buffalo, to Chicago, and other ports. The inland ports do not create revenue, but they do create tonnage. But the tonnage created on the Great Lakes is largely tonnage of weight; it would not compare in value with the coast tonnage. But there would be scarcely any tonnage for the Lakes if there were not waterways or railroads in the country radiating from the ports and carrying the raw materials where they may be fabricated or consumed.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. What does the inland waterway create? It creates neither tonnage nor revenue.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So the gentleman from Iowa returns to the attack. When the gentleman makes that statement he again shows his bias against the inland waterways and thinks he can get along without them. He can not. The gentleman comes from the interior and does not visit us in the great cities along the coast where the storm beats, but if he did he would have a different point of view. What would be the use of the millions of tons of iron and copper ore if it was not for the great cities of New York, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Toledo, Cleveland, and others?

Why, this vast tonnage to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] refers is manufactured in the State of Pennsylvania, and it goes into what? It goes into railroad tracks, it goes into the construction of bridges and into buildings, not only in this country, but just now it goes very largely into the great works developed by the European war.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose they could manufacture it where the ore is produced, if they wanted to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why do they not do it?

Mr. LENROOT. They are doing it now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am glad of it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. They are doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three minutes more. I would like to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has yielded the floor.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized and move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I do so only that I may take the time to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to me to make a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the gentleman from Minnesota desire?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of making this inquiry was this: In listening to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] I observed him to say that the commerce at the Duluth-Superior Harbor was largely one of bulk and not of value. May I inquire of the gentleman if he knows what the value of the commerce at the Duluth-Superior Harbor each year is?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I put that in the RECORD a day or two ago.

Mr. LENROOT. I gave it to the gentleman this morning.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So far as the foreign tonnage is concerned, it is just one-half what the foreign tonnage is on the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman state what the value of that is?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Great Lakes tonnage is about one-sixteenth of the foreign tonnage of the Atlantic coast. The lake tonnage is concentrated at the gentleman's port, it goes into the neck of a funnel and is easily calculated, while ours is distributed, and it is very difficult to get any statistics upon it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman state what the total tonnage is along the Atlantic coast?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will look in the RECORD—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Oh, if the gentleman has it he can give it. I don't want to look into the RECORD.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, I do not carry billions in my head or in my pocket.

Mr. HULBERT. I can give the gentleman the information that he is looking for.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will give the gentleman from New York an opportunity in a moment or two. I want to say that the value of the Duluth-Superior tonnage each year is upward of \$300,000,000, and if that is one-sixteenth of the value of the freight tonnage on the Atlantic seaboard, then that tonnage is vastly superior to anything that I have ever heard stated of it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Suppose, for the sake of argument, we accept the gentleman's figures as correct; does the gentleman deny that the people of the United States participate in it from Florida to the State of Washington?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am not denying anything.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman deny that we pay for that all over the country?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will assert this, that the tonnage at the Duluth-Superior Harbor is a tonnage serving all of the people of the great interior, and in addition somewhat the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Oh, wait one moment. I have the time. The gentleman has answered my question as best he can, which was not satisfactory to anyone, but I do not wish to tire his intellect further.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Oh, wait a minute until I can make a brief statement, and I will give the gentleman from New York an opportunity. Mr. Chairman, I always like to listen to these gentlemen from the Atlantic seaboard talk about their wonderful ports and cities. One would think that all the greatness of civilization was centered there. The tonnage of the Duluth-Superior Harbor each year, the number of clearances of boats, arrivals and departures, is greater than the combined commerce, the combined arrivals and departures at the ports of Boston, Philadelphia, New Orleans, and San Francisco.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why does the gentleman leave out New York?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. For the simple reason that I can not put New York in that class.

Mr. HULBERT. I am glad the gentleman excepts New York.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is a delightful Minnesota comparison.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It at least has the merit of being truthful.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; up to the point where the gentleman leaves off.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Very well, if the gentleman will wait a minute. Now we will turn our attention to New York, and I am glad to see for the first time in the history of Congress the gentleman from Philadelphia standing up to say something good about New York. Turning to the city of New York, which is so ably represented by the gentleman who is about to speak, if he gets the time, I beg to state that if they would just compile the figures, give us the tonnage of New York, then we would have something on which to base the comparison.

Mr. HULBERT. I am prepared to give the tonnage.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Then the gentleman can give something that the Board of Engineers of the Army has not heretofore been able to do.

Mr. HULBERT. I will give the figures of the customhouse.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HULBERT. During the 12 months ending December 31, 1915, the imports into the United States were valued at \$1,280,069,660, and of that total \$987,447,342 entered or went through the port of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HULBERT. I ask that I have half a minute in order to complete the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mississippi River, from Head of Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River, including salaries, clerical, office, traveling, and miscellaneous expenses of the Mississippi River Commission: Continuing improvement with a view to securing a permanent channel depth of 9 feet, \$6,000,000, which sum shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for the general improvement of the river, for the building of levees, and which may be done, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, by hired labor or otherwise, between Head of Passes and Cape Girardeau, Mo., and for surveys, including the survey from Head of Passes to the headwaters of the river, in such manner as in their opinion shall best improve navigation and promote the interests of commerce at all stages of the river: *Provided*, That of the moneys hereby appropriated so much as may be necessary shall be expended in the construction of suitable and necessary dredge boats and other devices and appliances and in the maintenance and operation of the same: *Provided further*, That the watercourses connected with said river and the harbors upon it, now under the control of the Mississippi River Commission and under improvement, together with the harbor at Vicksburg, Miss., which is hereby transferred to and placed under the control and jurisdiction of such commission, may, in the discretion of said commission, upon approval by the Chief of Engineers, receive allotments for improvements now under way or hereafter to be undertaken, to be paid for from the amount herein appropriated.

Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MILLER of Minnesota, and Mr. HULBERT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 2, after the word "appropriated," insert: "*Provided further*, That the report of the Mississippi River Commission contained in House Document No. 667, Sixty-third Congress, second session, shall not be construed as a project requiring special congressional action."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what is this for?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The purpose of this amendment is to make certain other language in the paragraph that has just been read. That language is contained in the last proviso before the amendment and is as follows:

Provided further, That the watercourses connected with said river and the harbors upon it, now under the control of the Mississippi River Commission and under improvement, together with the harbor at Vicksburg, Miss., which is hereby transferred to and placed under the control and jurisdiction of such commission, may, in the discretion of said commission—

And so forth.

Now, since this bill was framed Col. Townsend, the chairman of the Mississippi River Commission, stated in a letter to me that the language quoted would hardly, in his opinion, accomplish the purpose we have in view. I thought it would and think yet it ought to do it, but he has to expend the money furnished and to select the places where it is to be expended, and he thinks the language insufficient; hence the purpose is to make it certain.

Mr. MANN. Is that the project referred to in that document that is cited, at Vicksburg?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; that is the project referred to in the document.

Mr. MANN. Of course, there has been an effort for a long time by the Mississippi River Commission to take care of the harbor at Vicksburg.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And is that the document that refers to that matter?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; that is the one.

Mr. MANN. Theoretically, then, we are adopting that project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; we are not adopting a project.

Mr. MANN. I would say that theoretically we were adopting it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are rather excluding it than adopting it.

Mr. MANN. I do not think so. The amendment, as I understood it, authorizes the Mississippi River Commission to proceed with that project without requiring congressional action.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is for the purpose of making certain what Congress intends to do there. There is no necessity that any survey be ordered. The survey was made, and it has never been adopted and perhaps never would be adopted. The purpose has been for years to place this back under the control of the Mississippi River Commission, where it properly belongs.

Mr. MANN. I am not sure there is no doubt about that. We had long controversies in the House when the gentleman was opposing it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Every place similarly situated on the Mississippi River except this is under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission, so far as I know.

Mr. MANN. The purpose of the amendment, as I understand, is to permit the Mississippi River Commission to use its discretion about this improvement without further action by Congress?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. We want them to do it if they think it ought to be done. That is the purpose of this provision, and it is accomplished, I think, by the language we use here in the bill; if not, this amendment will.

Mr. MADDEN. The House acted in favor of this proposition last year, did it not, or the year before?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We had a similar provision to that in the bill of last year. We have put it in two bills, I believe.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the amendment be reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I wanted to ask the chairman what was really the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. COLLIER. I will explain it. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the purpose of this amendment is to clear up a difference in construction. For the benefit of those Members who were not here during the last Congress, I will state that some years ago there was a canal constructed in front of the city of Vicksburg. On the west bank of that canal a levee was erected not for the purpose of protection but the useful purpose of impounding the water of that canal and to make a scouring so that they would have a proper channel. Well, according to the report of the engineers, the amount of water coming through that canal from 800 miles of navigable streams—the Yazoo, the Sunflower, the Tallahatchie, and others, together with two crevasses in the levees in 1911 and 1912—brought an immense volume of water through that canal, much more than the engineers expected at the time, and the consequence was that the harbor at Vicksburg, upon which was situated railroad tracks, compresses, and warehouses, commenced rapidly to crumble into the canal, and it soon looked as though most of the harbor would be destroyed. I went before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and they gave me a survey. The district engineers passed favorably upon that survey, the board of engineers for Rivers and Harbors passed favorably upon it, the Mississippi River Commission passed upon the survey, and made a favorable report that the Government appropriate \$125,000 for revetment, provided that the city of Vicksburg appropriated \$32,500 to build a levee and give them the right of way.

By reason of a rule and custom of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, which does not instruct the Mississippi River Commission to do any particular work in any particular place, but leaving it to the discretion of the commission, it refused to put a direct appropriation in the bill. Some of the older Members will remember that this proposition came up in this House, and that on two separate occasions the House voted to put it in. The Rivers and Harbors Committee already have put in the bill instructions which they considered sufficient authority for the Mississippi River Commission to do this work. But the commission thinks otherwise.

Now we are coming to the matter in point. Col. Townsend, the chairman of the Mississippi River Commission, has con-

strued that when there is a survey on a special project, and a report has been made on that survey to Congress, that the commission is helpless to carry out the acts and purposes of the report unless specifically directed by Congress to do so. Now, this amendment simply gives the Mississippi River Commission authority and permission to do this work if, in their judgment, they so desire.

In other words, we are not asking for any more privilege than is given to any other piece of work on the Mississippi River over which the Mississippi River Commission has jurisdiction. We are simply asking Congress not to estop the Mississippi River Commission from attempting to do this work by reason of a survey, if the work is meritorious in the opinion of the commission and should be done.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. There is a reference on page 27, lines 20 and 21, to having the Mississippi River Commission take control of the harbor of Vicksburg. Is not that practically what the gentleman desires to have accomplished, and is not that what this amendment would accomplish, except that it goes up another stream? Is not that what the gentleman desires to have accomplished by lines 19 and 20, where we specifically say that the Mississippi River Commission shall take control of the harbor at Vicksburg? That is what the gentleman desires, is it not?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then, why the need of this amendment?

Mr. COLLIER. Because the man in accordance with whose opinion this work is to be done takes a different construction from that of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Gentlemen, we are confronted with this proposition: The Chief of Engineers says the work ought to be done; the Committee on Rivers and Harbors says the work ought to be done; the Mississippi River Commission says the work ought to be done; and a vote of this House, by tellers, said that the House believed the work ought to be done. Afterwards, on a separate amendment, the House declared, when the roll was called, that it believed the work ought to be done. Still later, when the rivers and harbors bill was in the Senate, when they made it a lump sum, one of the Senators whose name has been so often brought up on this floor stated that he was willing to let the Vicksburg amendment go in, and another Senator from the West, who was attacking river and harbor legislation, stated that that amendment so appealed to him that he would not object to it.

Now we are confronted with this situation: The commission and the engineers and Congress are willing that the work shall be done, but there is a difference of construction which must be cleared up. Col. Townsend contends that the construction that he places on the language in the bill will not permit him to do this work. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors claims that it will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DUPRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Unfortunately for this work, the last word in this matter belongs to Col. Townsend, and he makes a different construction.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I want to say that we have heard a great deal about commerce and navigation during the discussion of this bill. It is true that there is a commerce of \$33,000,000 at the city of Vicksburg. But we are not coming here to ask you to improve our harbor or to increase our navigation. A great deal of our harbor is now in the sea. We are not asking for damages for that, although we have suffered greatly. Warehouses, railroad tracks, and a great deal of our harbor have slumped off into the canal, and when I say to you that Vicksburg is situated upon high bluffs and there is only a small amount of level lands sufficient for harbor purposes there, which is being attacked and washed away, you will realize the importance of this amendment. We are simply asking you to stop the damage which is continually going on. Damage created by whom? By the Government. I say without fear of any kind of successful contradiction that a civil suit not only to stop the damages but to get damages for what has been

done would lie against anybody except the Government, which can not be sued.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The item on page 16 of the bill, for the improvement of the mouth of the Yazoo, places that project under the Engineers rather than under the Mississippi River Commission. I take it that is not in conflict with this item on page 27, although it would appear to be.

Mr. COLLIER. I did not catch the last word.

Mr. MANN. Under the heading of Mississippi River we provide that the improvement of the mouth of the Yazoo River should be under the control of the Secretary of War, and not under the control of the Mississippi River Commission. Under the item in the appropriation we apparently provide that it shall be under the control of the Mississippi River Commission. Now, which is it?

Mr. COLLIER. The Vicksburg Harbor and the mouth of the Yazoo River are two different propositions.

Mr. MANN. I supposed they were the same.

Mr. COLLIER. No. They are two different propositions in this: The Yazoo River was deflected by a canal which came down about 6 miles, passing in front of the city of Vicksburg. The city of Vicksburg is about half a mile, or a little more perhaps, from the Mississippi River. Those are two different propositions.

Mr. MANN. Then I was mistaken about that. But is not the harbor the mouth of the Yazoo River?

Mr. COLLIER. I say no; although it is one stream. There is a distinction there.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The mouth of the Yazoo empties into Lake Centennial, above the city of Vicksburg, 2 or 3 miles from the canal emptying into the river. There is a big lake. It is proposed to leave the mouth of the Yazoo several miles above there under the jurisdiction of the War Department, and to put the harbor at Vicksburg under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. MANN. The Yazoo does not flow, then, into the Mississippi River?

Mr. COLLIER. It is brought by a canal to Lake Centennial. Lake Centennial was caused by the cut-off at Vicksburg in 1876, when the river left Vicksburg half a mile to the north.

This is simply a matter of construction. The engineers and different Members of Congress seemed to want this work done, but there is a difference in the construction of the language which prevents it from being done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief explanation to show the difference between this proposition and the one that was urged here last year and the year before. The construction which the Mississippi River Commission puts upon this matter, I think, is the correct one. I think they put exactly the construction on the law that ought to be put on it. Vicksburg is not now under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission. It was taken out from under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission a number of years ago, and it was decided to put it back under the Mississippi River Commission.

Now, in that same bill a survey was asked for the harbor at Vicksburg. Here is the general law that the Mississippi River Commission was bound to go by:

The Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until funds for the commencement of the proposed work shall have been actually appropriated by law.

So that, although they recommended the appropriation of \$125,000 in their report, they could not spend that \$125,000 until the project was actually adopted. Last year and the year before, at the suggestion of my colleague [Mr. COLLIER], the House adopted this project specifically, and authorized the expenditure of \$125,000 on it. That is not proposed to-day at all. It is now proposed simply to pass a resolution declaring that this survey heretofore ordered shall not be regarded as a project requiring special congressional action; so that out of the general fund appropriated for the Mississippi River Commission which is carried in this bill that commission may, if it chooses to do so, make allotments to the harbor at Vicksburg, thereby placing Vicksburg exactly in the same status as every other harbor on the river. We do not direct them to do it and we do not say they shall not do it. As the law stands to-day, it says they shall not do anything at Vicksburg, because there has been a survey of it and the survey has not been acted upon. We propose simply to annul that and to say that that survey shall not be construed as a project requiring special congressional action, and to leave it thereafter to the judgment of the com-

mission—not out of any additional \$125,000 appropriated, as was done heretofore, but out of the lump sum which is appropriated for the river. If they see fit to do it, they can take care of the harbor at Vicksburg.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. This amendment would simply transfer the jurisdiction to the Mississippi River Commission, and then the Mississippi River Commission would proceed to make the improvement, and therefore they would get a project into this bill that is a new project, and that we have not put in heretofore.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No; the Mississippi River Commission could proceed. That is, it puts Vicksburg back under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission. Now, this survey that was put in there a few years ago was a mistake.

Mr. COLLIER. And that made the whole trouble.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The House adopted the provision for the survey. When the bill went over to the Senate, the Senate said, "We will transfer Vicksburg back to the commission," but it did not take out the order for the survey, by some piece of bad luck, and there it stands.

Mr. COLLIER. And that has been the whole trouble.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. That left it with Vicksburg put under the Mississippi River Commission, but with the law saying, "Although Vicksburg is under the Mississippi River Commission, you shall not do anything for it." Now, we want to do away with that discrimination, and put Vicksburg on the same footing as every other harbor on the river.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that if we had never had the survey there would be no necessity at all for this amendment, because then the Mississippi River Commission would have had the power to do the work there the same as at any other harbor; but this survey acts as a bar, which prevents the Mississippi River Commission from doing that work.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the situation in regard to this item is this: The report of the engineers showed that this proposed improvement was not in the interest of navigation, and the committee refused to put it in the bill. Here upon the floor of the House it was inserted on at least one occasion. I think probably the second time it was voted down, but at one time it was put in.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Carrying a specific appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Carrying a specific appropriation. Now, that would come under a new project if we had to appropriate for it at this time, so that this is simply an ingenious way of putting another new project into the bill. That is all it means, because if we make the transfer now over to the Mississippi River Commission then it goes into the bill and becomes a new project and they can reach it, when if the proposition came up directly we would not put it in because it is a new project.

Mr. CLINE. I understand that this bill carries about \$6,000,000 for Mississippi River improvements.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know the total amount.

Mr. MADDEN. Six million dollars.

Mr. CLINE. Suppose that the Flood Prevention Committee should report a bill carrying \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000, or any other amount, would not that constitute a dislocation of the plan of improvements of the Mississippi River?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Of course, we can not tell. This is a flood provision to some extent, because this is to prevent the destruction of that bank, but what I wish to call specially to the attention of the committee is that this is not only a new project, but a project that ought not to be appropriated for, anyway, because while there is damage done, this is not in the interest of navigation, and the proposition to appropriate this money is very largely to take care of the railroads that cross at that particular point, their property, and their bridges and their levees.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman believe that the language carried in the provision which transfers the harbor at Vicksburg back to the Mississippi River Commission ought to remain in the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am inclined to think it ought to be transferred back there, probably.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. If it ought to be transferred back, ought the law to be permitted to stand as it does now, to wit, that it is hereby transferred back to the Mississippi River Commission, but that they shall not be allowed to do any work on it?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not think there ought to be any work done on it. I do not think it is a meritorious project. I do not think it ought to be improved. I think, as I said before, that this is simply an indirect way of getting another new project into this bill; and, in addition to that, it is a project that ought not to go into the bill. It is true there is some damage shown there, but we have not elsewhere appropriated for such projects. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] had a great deal to say about his project, and, as I recall it, it was of the same character, where there was some damage occasioned by what the Government had done; and in equity I suppose the Government ought to pay, but we never established that rule. In this case it is a railroad, and I think they ought to be able to take care of it themselves.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I differ from my colleague from Washington. So far as the merits are concerned in the harbor at Vicksburg, if this is adopted it will be a matter for the Mississippi River Commission. If it is not meritorious I do not suppose they will do any work. All this does, as I understand, is to put back under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission what was formerly taken away from it by reason of a survey which has been construed by the commission as taking it out of their jurisdiction.

I think, as the gentleman from Mississippi says, if there had been no special survey made the commission would hold that they were not barred from doing the work.

But what I rose specially for was to say that in my opinion this is about the only real urgent proposition in the bill. You talk about the emergency at New York City, but here is a harbor that is actually washing away. Photographs were brought before the committee showing that the land and the tracks of a railway were going into the river, and cotton compresses also. I, for one, am not afraid to vote for a proposition that will protect land on which some railroad track is located, or upon which some cotton compresses are situated. There would be no necessity for the harbor for Vicksburg if it were not for the cotton compresses and the railroads that bring the cotton in from the back country towns.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWITZER. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman talks about an emergency. These photographs were brought in five years ago, and it has not fallen into the river yet.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. They absolutely went in this year.

Mr. SWITZER. The argument of the gentleman from Washington is that nothing should be done until the land is all washed into the harbor.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. This was a double track, and both tracks went in.

Mr. SWITZER. The committee put this in, but the trouble is Col. Townsend construes the language that we used in putting this in as a recommendation, as not accomplishing what we intended. All this provision seeks to do is to carry out the intent of the majority of the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ascertain if we can not agree on some limit of time for the discussion. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto end in 10 minutes, 5 to be given to the gentleman from Massachusetts and 5 to be controlled by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this amendment relates only to the harbor at Vicksburg. I am advised that other amendments will be offered, and if they are offered I would like to discuss them. I hope the gentleman will confine his request to debate on this amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well, Mr. Chairman; I will withhold the request for the present.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is best that we should understand the situation as regards the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee. We recognize the situation as it exists at Vicksburg. Gentlemen have appeared before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in good faith and shown what the condition actually was. It is one that I for one feel deserves attention. In lines 19 and 20 we direct the Mississippi River Commission to take over the harbor at Vicksburg. There is nothing plainer than that. On top of that, the chairman offers an amendment that we adopt a project in Document No. 667, Sixty-third Congress, second session. There is

nothing else to that but a vote to adopt another new project. It is in the nature of an instruction to the Mississippi River Commission to undertake a new project without even having this House pass upon the merits of the project. They have general authority over the Mississippi River, and we are instructing them to look after the harbor at Vicksburg.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Has not the Mississippi River Commission declared that it had no jurisdiction over the harbor at Vicksburg?

Mr. TREADWAY. But we are giving them absolute jurisdiction in this bill.

Mr. DUPRÉ. And have they not said that that language was not sufficient to carry out the purpose?

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, if the House desires to adopt that project as another new project and have another way to get in new projects into this bill, all well and good. I discussed the method previously as to how new projects are coming into the bill, and now we are having an illustration this morning of another new method of getting them into the bill. I compliment the men who were against the adoption of new projects on their capacity and skill in getting this one in. I was one of those who voted against the rule not to adopt any new projects, and I am more than glad that I did so vote when I see the methods used now to adopt new projects.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman thinks that Vicksburg ought to be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission?

Mr. TREADWAY. On the representations made before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I do.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman think that it ought to be transferred to the Mississippi River Commission with the proviso that they shall not spend any money on it?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I think there is no more reason for instructing the Mississippi River Commission what they should do in this particular than in any other portion of their work. The phraseology in the bill simply puts under their general control the harbor of Vicksburg, and that is as far as this House ought to go, unless it is ready once more to stultify itself by the adoption of another new project. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new project; it is not an attempt by any circumlocution or legerdemain to put a new project on this bill, and I hope that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] will give me his attention for a moment. I, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, although this was in my own State, was opposed to putting this project in, and was opposed to directing the commission to spend any money, and voted against that proposition here on the floor of the House when it came up. That proposition was to adopt the project and direct the Mississippi River Commission to expend \$125,000 at Vicksburg. I was unwilling to do that. I was willing to do this, to put the Vicksburg Harbor under the Mississippi River Commission, leaving it to their judgment whether they should spend money for that harbor, putting it exactly upon the same status as every other harbor along that river.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Suppose this item were not in the bill at all—to transfer the harbor to the Mississippi River Commission—would an item to make a direct appropriation directing the Chief of Engineers to do this work be a new project?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It would.

Mr. MANN. So that it is beating the devil around the stump in another way.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I think not, and for this reason—

Mr. MANN. The original item was a new project.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman give me his attention?

Mr. MANN. I always do.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I think I will convince him, if he does listen to me.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has not begun yet to convince me. Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I will convince the gentleman now, if he will listen. We transfer this to the Mississippi River Commission and say nothing more. Very well. What is the law on the subject to-day? A survey has been hereto-

fore ordered for the specific project at Vicksburg, and what is the law:

The Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until funds for the commencement of the proposed work shall have been actually appropriated by law.

What does the engineer say under that, and I think he properly construes the law? He concludes that until Congress acts upon this particular survey his hands are tied, and he will do nothing.

Mr. MANN. I agree with the engineer.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Very well.

Mr. MANN. That is evidence that it is a new project.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. That it is a separate project, absolutely—that that was a new and separate and distinct project, and Congress refused to adopt it and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors refused to adopt it, but they now say, "We will transfer this harbor back under the Mississippi River Commission."

Mr. MANN. That of itself is a new project.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Oh, listen to me. If the gentleman will, I can convince him, I think, and not against his will. The law as it stands to-day, even if we transfer it back to the Mississippi River Commission, as construed by the Mississippi River Commission, and properly construed, is that, although it is transferred they have no power to act. We propose to say, not that this new project directing the commission to spend \$125,000 shall be adopted, but that it shall not be considered as a project requiring special congressional action. In other words, we repeal the law that ordered the survey and now say, "We will transfer the harbor to you; treat it as you would any other harbor upon the river, and if you think it ought to have money, give it to it, and if you do not, do not give it to it." To simply transfer the harbor back to the Mississippi River Commission with the law as it stands would be to say, "Hang your clothes on a hickory limb, but don't go near the water."

Mr. MANN. Absolutely. The gentleman has convinced me that it is a new project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, only a few words. As I stated a while ago, it is not a new project in any sense of the word. When we adopt a project we appropriate and direct the engineers to spend money upon it. In this case we do not direct them to spend any money at all. The only thing we do—and we do it independently of the project to which reference is made in the amendment—is to place Vicksburg under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission, just like every other portion of the river from the mouth of the Ohio down to the mouth of the Mississippi. We place it under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission, leaving it to that body to say whether it will expend any money there and how much. We do not direct them to expend any, as we do when we adopt a project. When we adopt a project we name the project, and thus designate the place where the work is to be done. We give the number of the report and make the appropriation, which is equivalent to a direction to the engineers to spend the money on the project. But there is no direction here. The language leaves it within their discretion to say whether they will expend any money there or not. If they follow the course they have heretofore, if they continue to entertain the opinion they have entertained heretofore, as I have interpreted that opinion they will expend no money whatever at that place. In the course of time they may do it, but I doubt very much whether they will expend any money there within the next few years. I think that is all I care to say. If I thought we were adopting a new project, I would not offer the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, we have seen quite a number of efforts at this session in the consideration of this bill to insert or strike out items contrary to the wish of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the committee, and most of the Members of the House probably will not remember when anything of the kind was ever done. I take off my hat to the genial gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLLIER, who is getting his way about this item now, and I compliment the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that they know when they are licked. They do not want to run up against a stone wall too many times in succession. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] turned the Committee on Rivers and Harbors upside down across his knee a few days ago and treated it like a naughty child, and I aided him, thinking his cause was worthy, and he said to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, in effect, "As to Vicksburg, before you determine what you will do, see me." [Laughter.]

Now, I think the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is right now, though doubtless this is a new project, but an urgent one.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MANN. I am glad the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] is going to get his way this time without spanking the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I am glad that he has them properly under subjection. It is a good thing, and shows that once in a while in the House a real meritorious project, backed by a very able and congenial gentleman, can win, notwithstanding the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOWARD). The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]. The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], a member of the committee, will be recognized first and then the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. FREAR: Page 27, line 1, after the word "feet," strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000."

Mr. FREAR. The appropriation proposed will give \$1,000 a mile to the Mississippi River which, under the circumstances, ought to be sufficient for purposes of navigation. The Flood Committee, which has recently been organized, according to press report expects to receive an appropriation from the Government in the neighborhood of \$45,000,000. I do not know whether that is correct or not, but I state it just as reported, with an understanding that it is to be distributed over five years, which, if this remains in the bill in its present form, and \$9,000,000 more is inserted, will bring the appropriations this year up to \$15,000,000 for the lower Mississippi.

The purpose of these appropriations for the lower Mississippi has always been known, although it has not been frankly stated sometimes, to be for reclamation purposes largely and not for navigation, because the commerce on the lower Mississippi River has very largely disappeared. And as an evidence of that I quote from the Mississippi River Commission's report of 1912, wherein the commission says:

While the levees have a certain degree of utility in the improvement of the channel and are necessary to "promote the interests of commerce" by providing landing places for the interchange of traffic in times of flood and protecting the lines of railway behind them, their immediate and main value is the protection of the alluvial lands for the benefit of their owners.

What need be added to this unqualified admission by an official agent of the parties in interest?

Quoting from the comprehensive brief of Hon. B. E. Moses, of Memphis, he says in this connection:

This so-called protection of the alluvial lands along the Mississippi River is primarily and fundamentally a work of "reclamation," as that term is generally understood. * * * The history of the levee system along the Mississippi River is merely a repetition of the fight of mankind from time immemorial to reclaim for cultivation the fertile alluvial plains of the rivers of the world. The futility of the fight under the past method of "levees only" is apparent and real and has been impressed upon the people of the valley during the floods of the last two years by ruin, starvation, and death, incident to the breaks in the levee system.

The Government is reclaiming lands that were never before used, and for the benefit of private interests. This purpose is not disputed by any recognized authority, so far as I can ascertain.

THE GOVERNMENT'S DUTY AND LIMITATIONS.

Several years ago Congress commissioned some of her ablest men to make a thorough study of the waterway question and to make recommendations. These men, composing the United States National Waterways Commission, did make a careful investigation of waterways, both in this country and Europe. Fresh from that investigation they laid down certain principles of governmental action that condemn the expenditures now being made on the Mississippi land-reclamation scheme. I quote from the report on this question, as follows:

It should always be borne in mind that the waterway improvements made by the Federal Government under the exercise of its authority should be restricted to navigation. Whenever bank protection or flood prevention or the clarification of water is the sole object of improvements the question presents little difficulty in its solution. Such projects are not a proper charge upon the Federal Treasury. * * * In many instances proposed improvements have as their main object the protection or benefit of private property. In such cases there is a distinct benefit conferred upon individuals or localities which is only of a remote or very indirect benefit to the country as a whole. Lands subject to periodical overflow or lands of uncertain value because of the danger of erosion, when improved, are multiplied many times in value, and there is a constant danger that such improvements will be advocated under the guise of river and harbor legislation framed to benefit

navigation when the real object is the benefit which will accrue to individuals or localities. The line should be carefully drawn between improvements which, in whole or in part, are for the protection or development of private property and those which are made in the sole interest of navigation.

This report from which the foregoing is quoted was signed by Theodore E. Burton, chairman; J. H. Gallinger, vice chairman; S. H. Piles, William Alden Smith, F. M. Simmons, James P. Clarke, William Lorimer, D. S. Alexander, Frederick C. Stevens, Irving P. Wanger, Stephen M. Sparkman, and John A. Moon.

The statement from the Mississippi River Commission is comprehensive, and I have inserted in the Record, in addition to that, the statement of one or two other authorities who live in the Mississippi Valley.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if that be for reclamation it is practically part of the duties of the new flood commission to undertake. When that is done I understand there is to be some determination of what proportion will be paid by the people who own these alluvial lands. That is to say, a basis will be established for the purpose of aiding people who are to have their lands reclaimed.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. In a moment. That is the situation as I now understand it. There can be no justification for such a large amount for purposes of commerce. The River and Harbor Committee is to-day discussing these questions from the standpoint of navigation. Now, this has been taken away from them. It ought no longer to stand in the way, because we have a Flood Committee prepared to act, and when it does act I assume it will determine what will be a fair proportion of the money to be paid by the various landowners along the Mississippi Valley.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to ask for any further time in explanation, but I will yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ].

Mr. DUPRÉ. Do you make any distinction, in your mind, between the reclamation of uncultivable lands and the devastation of lands that are already under cultivation?

Mr. FREAR. It is given out as for the reclamation of lands. They unite that question with flood conditions. But here is a condition explained by the commission itself, that has been for reclaiming land all of these years, instead of for navigation, the purpose over which we are supposed to have jurisdiction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, something has been said by the gentleman from Wisconsin about the commerce of the Mississippi River, and in the minority report filed by the gentleman he uses this language:

The greatest river, the Mississippi, has lost over 90 per cent of its commerce during the past 40 years. Good authorities estimate the loss at 95 per cent. Approximately \$150,000,000 has been expended on the river, and about one-half of that amount within the past dozen years, without adding anything to its commerce. From 16,000,000 to 20,000,000 acres of land belonging to private parties, valued at over \$100 per acre on the average, is being reclaimed by the Government, and yet experts and reputable residents along the river declare the entire levee system is wasteful, and so-called river improvements are a makeshift and sure to be disappointing. From the viewpoint of navigation the Mississippi has only a slight local commerce, justifying no more than nominal expenditures. Experimental and political methods of extending flood relief have become notoriously extravagant and unsatisfactory.

The Bureau of Corporations of the Department of Commerce published several years ago several volumes—four, I think—on the question of water transportation, and in the second volume, entitled "Transportation by Water in the United States," I obtain this data:

The principal traffic on the river in the early days consisted of shipment of grain from St. Louis to New Orleans, and in 1875, just 40 years ago, the tonnage of such shipments amounted to 187,520 tons. The receipts of cotton at New Orleans for the same year amounted to 8,640 tons, or a total of 196,160 tons.

That was 40 years ago. The grain shipments on the river reached their highest point in 1880, when they amounted to 441,354 tons, and the receipts of cotton that year at New Orleans by river amounted to 170,094 tons, a total of 611,448 tons.

Now, I would like gentlemen to keep those figures in mind a moment. The reports of the Chief of Engineers for 1915 show the commerce passing between St. Louis and Cairo for the year 1914 as having been 325,164 tons; between Cairo and Memphis, 1,321,081 tons; and between Memphis and Vicksburg, 1,880,394 tons; between Vicksburg and New Orleans, 2,343,623 tons.

Now, without attempting to get the aggregate of that tonnage, upon the theory that much of it is duplicated, simply take, if you please, the commerce between Vicksburg and New Orleans for the year 1914 at 2,243,623 tons, while the commerce 40 years ago amounted to 196,160 tons, and in the greatest year, 1880, a total of 611,448 tons. I submit this data as a contribution from an official publication by the Department of

Commerce in comparison with the statement contained in the minority report of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Has my time expired, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. SMALL. Now the gentleman stated further—and I use this language, quoting from his report:

Approximately \$150,000,000 had been expended on the river, and about one-half of that amount within the past dozen years, without adding anything to its commerce.

These are the facts: The total amount appropriated for the whole river down to the Passes from 1903 to 1914 was \$58,366,575. So it is not \$75,000,000 or one-half of \$150,000,000, as stated in the gentleman's report.

Now, of that \$58,000,000, a portion—how large I do not know—was expended on that reach of the river, about 100 miles, between New Orleans and the Passes. I submit that when minority reports are filed, when statements are made which are given credence by the press and by the country, more care should be taken as to accuracy than is displayed in this particular report upon the Mississippi River.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I will say this, that in the bill itself South Pass is called a part of the Mississippi River. It has always been that. The gentleman deducts the appropriation, takes it away. I am not going to discuss the question of commerce on the river in a few moments remaining, because that is confusing, and I have endeavored to get the true figures from the analysis made in the past after considering duplication and quadruplication excluding coal and because coal was repeatedly counted on the river at different points. I wish to say this, that if gentlemen of the House will look into the Record tomorrow they will see a comparison as to the Tennessee River between the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina and the statement I have made based upon the official reports, and I am sure that in this case as in others the figures will show that he has given a wrong understanding of the statistics of that river.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes to correct the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman from Wisconsin is mistaken about the Passes being a part of the Mississippi River project. They have always been considered separate and apart from it, and have been appropriated for separately. The commerce passing in and out of the Passes at the mouth of the Mississippi River is always given separately from that on the Mississippi River proper. If I had the memorandum here that I just handed to the reporter I would be able to give the commerce for 1914, but I can say, approximately, that there was a total in that year of over 6,000,000 tons of commerce passing through the South and Southwest Passes, independent of that commerce on the Mississippi River to which I referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time on the paragraph has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I have asked for this time, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of making an explanation to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] and several other gentlemen who have made inquiries of me. If the Committee on Flood Control succeeds in passing a bill that will take care of the Mississippi River hereafter, the appropriations that will be made in pursuance of that bill will come in the sundry civil bill next year. The only appropriation for the Mississippi River that will be made for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, will be carried in the river and harbor bill, whatever that may be.

The Committee on Flood Control has no power to appropriate, only to authorize; and whatever may be authorized in that bill will be carried in the sundry civil bill that will be adopted next winter, so that the gentleman is in error in supposing that what-

ever the Committee on Flood Control may provide for the Mississippi River will be in addition to what is carried in this bill. There will be nothing carried in that bill and nothing authorized in that bill for the year which will be taken care of by the six millions in this bill.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will there be any cessation in the meantime of the local contributions that will be made on the part of the people down there?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No. As to those local contributions, the law has never required any local contributions. Heretofore the figures have been estimated and stated loosely, but now the commission has at last gathered this information together under the direction of Congress, and their report shows that on the Mississippi River proper the local interests have contributed since 1882 more than \$80,000,000 for the construction of levees, whereas the Federal Government during that same time has contributed \$32,000,000. But there has been no law compelling that.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. This appropriation—the larger portion of it—is to be used, is it not, for the reclamation of the alluvial lands, as stated by the Mississippi River Commission, as it has been done in the past?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No. The Mississippi River Commission, with all due respect to the gentleman, although he read it only five minutes ago, never did state that. It is not stated in what the gentleman just read, and it is not a fact. What he read was that the main purpose of the levee is to protect the country from overflow. Now, he states that the principal part of the sum appropriated will be expended for reclamation.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The principal part of the sum appropriated will never go into levees, and never has gone into them. It will go for other work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question, so long as he has an extension of time?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. What is the basis for the contributions to-day for those people to have their lands reclaimed?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. As I said, it has been stated to be about 3 to 1 for levee construction.

Mr. FREAR. Has that any determinate basis that you have to work upon?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. None at all. The law has never required any of it at all, but Congress has appropriated so little money for the construction of levees that the people there have taxed themselves to the utmost extent to raise all they could, and whether Congress gave much or little, they contributed all that they could raise by the most onerous system of taxation.

Mr. FREAR. Were not those contributions largely at an early day? Have they been recently?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No; they have been made since 1882. Prior to 1882 the Government contributed nothing whatever, and there were vast sums spent then, I do not know how much. But you understand we could not proceed rapidly; we would get the levees up to a reasonable height, and a flood would come and wash them down, and we would have to do it over again. Then as the reclamation of the upper valley proceeded, the waters were precipitated into the lower valley so rapidly that the rush of the waters began to wash down the banks of the river and cave the levees into the river. I will give the gentleman one illustration of that—

Mr. FREAR. About how many acres are included in the lands which it is proposed to reclaim?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. There are 20,000,000 acres in the Delta. Of course, the gentleman understands that all that reclamation is to be done by the people. Congress is not expected to do anything in the way of reclamation.

Mr. FREAR. I understand there are about 2,000,000 acres which it is proposed to reclaim.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. There are 20,000,000 acres.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. As the gentleman has put the question, and as the answer reads, it would appear that this money is appropriated to reclaim 20,000,000 acres of land.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. That is not the case at all.

Mr. FREAR. Each year that contribution is directed toward that purpose, is it not?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Not at all. It never has been. It is directed toward the construction of levees. The Government has contributed a very small portion of that, and for many years it was limited by act of Congress, so that no levees could be built for the purpose of preventing overflow, but that levees should be constructed only in the interest of navigation. After the floods have been controlled the reclamation of the land is left entirely to the people. That costs them from \$30 to \$40 an acre, which they themselves pay. It has never been in their contemplation and never in their hope that the Federal Government would contribute anything toward reclamation of the land.

But I was telling you about these waters that rush down on us and cave the levees into the river after we build them. I have two levee districts in my congressional district, one with a levee line 189 miles long. Since 1882 we have abandoned 180 miles out of 189 miles on account of the caving of the banks. In other words, we have practically built that line of levees twice. And that occurs all along. By the time we get them half built, this great volume of water comes along and caves them into the river, and we have to start all over again.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Who paid for that?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The people in my district paid for it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That did not come out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Not a nickel of it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How much has the Government contributed, and how much have private interests contributed?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. So far as the construction of the levees on the river itself is concerned, private individuals have contributed some \$80,000,000. Of course they have built some levees up the tributaries, and counting in those levees on tributaries the private owners have contributed \$91,000,000 since 1882. During that time the Federal Government has contributed \$32,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman has stated that three times.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended five minutes, to allow him to answer a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let us see if we can not agree on the length of time. How much time does the gentleman from Mississippi desire?

Mr. FREAR. I ask that the gentleman from Mississippi have five minutes more.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. All I want is time to answer my friend's question.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I want time enough to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] desires to offer an amendment, and would like to have five minutes on it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. What is the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will confine my request to this particular amendment then.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman had better make it cover the paragraph.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then I will ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. I wish to ask the gentleman a question. He says the Government has made no contribution toward these levees which have been washed out.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Oh, no; I did not say that. At least I did not intend to.

Mr. FREAR. I did not think the gentleman intended to be so understood. The Government has engaged in building these levees, has it not?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. And some of these levees have been washed out.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Very largely so in the case mentioned.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. And the Government is replacing those levees. Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The Government is contributing a very little toward it, but has contributed something; but the vast amount of the Federal money is spent for other purposes, purposes which the engineer says are in the interest of navigation. The bulk of this money goes for revetment and channel improvements and for the administration of the commission.

Mr. FREAR. But that all aids in this matter of reclamation, does it not, supporting the levees?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It does aid by keeping the floods off the land, undoubtedly.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Was it not testified before the committee that Louisiana had spent \$45,000,000 since 1870 on the Mississippi River?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It was a large amount; I do not recollect the figures.

Mr. DUPRÉ. And was it not stated also that the city of New Orleans was taxed \$700,000 annually for levee purposes?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I do not recollect the figures. Everything is taxed in my district; the land is taxed 17½ mills, and 5 cents an acre in addition, a dollar a bale on all cotton in addition, and a tax on every privilege. For instance, a man who does any business whatever for profit, whether he drives a wagon, practices law, or runs a store, or what not, is taxed for the privilege, and that goes into the levees. In other districts they tax potatoes, rice, sugar, molasses, every ton of hay, and every barrel of oysters that are gathered, because the muddy water that overflows and goes into the ocean injures the oysters.

Mr. MANN. That is done wherever the Democrats have full control. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Well, we have full control down there, and the story that Adam Bede used to tell when he was a Member of Congress always struck me as if he had our people in view. It was a hard-luck story, and ran this way:

His horse went dead and his mule went lame,
And he lost his cow in a poker game;
Then a cyclone came on a summer's day
And blew the house, where he lived, away;
Then an earthquake came, and when that was gone,
And swallowed the ground that the house stood on,
Then the tax collector came around
And charged him up with the hole in the ground.

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 2, after the word "appropriated," insert as a new paragraph the following:

"And the Mississippi River Commission shall report to Congress before December 1, 1916, an estimate of the cost of levee construction necessary to be done to complete the project."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is the largest and most important item in the bill, but it is not criticized on the ground that is usually used in criticizing smaller items. Six million dollars is here to be appropriated for this particular part of the Mississippi River. In view of previous legislation and the interests to be served, I am in favor of the appropriation as it stands. I remember that it came in at one time as an emergency appropriation, because of floods. I have looked into the question of cooperation of the States along the line, and while the States frequently complained that the floods come down from the North, due to erosion and other causes, I found it true that Mississippi and Louisiana especially were contributing very largely of their own means, by way of co-operation, and that, it seemed to me, was commendable. But there are some things about the authority given the Mississippi River Commission that are so different from work in other sections of the country that it occasions wonder why some of our newspaper critics and others who are influenced by newspaper criticism on the floor of the House do not comment upon them,

The Mississippi River Commission is given power to build dredges—

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The Mississippi River Commission was directed to make this report, and has made it, and we have it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To complete the work?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much did it amount to?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It was three or four years ago, and they estimated that to complete the system of levees would cost \$57,000,000; and since that quite a lot of work has been done, and they now estimate that it can be completed for about \$40,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That takes into account the appropriations made since the report was made?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. And the contributions by the local interests.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am frank to say that I offered this amendment for the purpose of having some discussion on the subject. I am glad the gentleman from Mississippi responds. But I wish to say that this is a \$6,000,000 item we are voting into the bill, without scarcely a word as to the manner in which it is spent, for the construction of dredges and providing devices that do not apply to other improvements apart from the Mississippi. The gentleman from Iowa has not commented upon the appropriation for dredges, and I suppose they overlook it because Iowa is bounded by the Mississippi River—

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. These dredges are operated and owned by the United States Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is true, but it might be criticized if applied to the country where they are doing the work by private contract.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have not the time.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I only wanted to say that levee construction has been greatly cheapened within the last few years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. By the construction of Government dredges that may all be. But here we are appropriating \$6,000,000 in one item and little or nothing is said about it. If some poor little creek was to be taken care of at an expense of \$1,000 or so it would be criticized to the limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Any funds which are herein, or may hereafter be, appropriated by Congress for improving the Mississippi River between Head of Passes and the mouth of the Ohio River, and which may be allotted to levees, may be expended, under the direction of the Secretary of War, in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for levees upon any part of said river between Head of Passes and Rock Island, Ill., in such manner as, in their opinion, shall best improve navigation and promote the interest of commerce at all stages of the river.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It was impossible in the five minutes I had to say what I desired to say with reference to the enthusiasts who criticize river and harbor bills because, perchance, \$1,000 happens to be appropriated for the improvement of a stream. When we get to a six-million-dollar item they have nothing to say. It is the small stream pouring into the big one that makes the flood that causes the trouble in the Mississippi Valley; but it is just as we find it sometimes in ordinary financial affairs. If a man steals a million dollars he invites public attention, but if he steals a loaf of bread he goes to jail. Why do not some of the gentlemen from Iowa who have been opposing this bill, and along whose territory we are now passing, rise and make some observations? Rock Island is in the vicinity of the Mississippi at this point, and yet I observe there is not a single gentleman from the Iowa delegation here to say a word of criticism.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I beg the gentleman not to interrupt me at this point. Oh, I see the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is here. I beg his pardon.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state what benefit Iowa is to get out of this?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why, Iowa gets to the Gulf and the Panama Canal through the Mississippi River.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But what portion of this fund is to be expended for the benefit of Iowa?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is improving the Mississippi River along the borders of Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But that is the part that does not need improvement.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania know that Iowa is north of Missouri and not south?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. But this only goes to the Missouri.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then we will apply it to the next item.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Of course, we could not expect the editor or the president of the bulletin of the Inland Deep Waterways Association, which placed Minneapolis halfway up Minnehaha Falls, to know just exactly where on the map Iowa would be located.

Mr. MANN. He evidently did not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop] misread the article to which he refers. I did not write it, however. It is pleasing to get a rise out of our Iowa friends. I have brought them to book on a \$6,000,000 appropriation, passing up to their own State, about which they have nothing to say.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, can we not agree upon some time? How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. GOOD. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes—two minutes to be controlled by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, there are certain rivers and harbors in the United States well recognized as needing improvement. One of them is the Delaware, one of them is the Mississippi, and another of them is the Ohio. We are all agreed about that, but I want to say to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that, if it has brought in a bill carrying five or six millions of dollars for the Mississippi in order to get the vote of the Members of the House from Iowa, that committee will be disappointed. I object to this bill because of the principle upon which it was apparently drawn. I object to it not because it has some worthy items in it, but because it is loaded with so many items that are not worthy. Gentlemen say there is no politics in the bill, but before election day comes in November those who vote for it will find that it is loaded with politics. Take the hearings, for instance. I have here the hearings on the Galveston Harbor project, and that is but illustrative of what was done in other items. The chairman says:

Col. Taylor has nothing in his report to say that any bad effects came from the failure of the Government to finish the sea wall.

Again the chairman says:

Nothing has happened so far to show that this—

The sea wall appropriated for—is immediately necessary.

Speaking again about the sea wall, the chairman says:

We have a report to the effect that \$475,000 will be necessary to restore the conditions that existed before the storm. Now, regarding the sea wall, the engineers first report that while it was a convenience and might in time prove of use in arresting wave action in case of severe storms, yet they did not think it urgent, because the danger was rather remote.

Again, the chairman asked Mr. Gresham:

Now, which would you prefer having done—the sea wall, which the engineers say is not urgent, or the other, which they say is?

Mr. Gresham, who says that he has spent the flower of his life lobbying for this provision, says:

By all means we would prefer the sea wall.

And the sea wall goes into the bill.

Yet they say this is a meritorious bill, every item of it is a meritorious item. Why, one gentleman, talking about the river in his district for which we made an appropriation, says that it has no well-defined banks, and that if you are not careful when you go down to the river you will cross it before you know you have reached it. Yet we propose to make it navigable by appropriation. And there is the Wateree River, in which nobody has discovered any water. We are irrigating some of these southern streams in order to get appropriations to make them navigable. Do you think for one moment that with an empty Treasury the people would approve of these outlandish appropriations? You will be deceived in that. You argue that, because Senator Burton was at one time in favor of some of these projects. So he was. But it is passing strange that now after an experience of 10 or 15 years had demonstrated that they were valueless for navigation purposes you should keep on voting for them. You vote for them after Burton re-

pudiated them. That is just the difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. We discover our mistakes and try to rectify them. You refuse to follow our successes, but take up our failures and follow them, even in the face of an empty Treasury. That is what you have done in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, so far as the Rivers and Harbors Committee is concerned, there is no politics in this bill. And I wish to say, further, that if anyone here or elsewhere thinks the people of this country are going to vote against anybody because he favors, or any party because it passes, a river and harbor bill, he will wake up on the morning after the next election and find himself very much deceived. There is, in my judgment, in this country no more popular measure than those annual river and harbor bills. The people want this great work to go on, and they are going to have it go on.

Now, we may have made some mistakes in the bill, as I said at the outset, but we have asked this House to correct us where it thinks we are wrong, to strike out what is not right. Has there been anything stricken out yet? The membership here has stood by the committee up to date, a majority at least, and it has not done so because there is any politics in the bill, but because they think that, in the main, it is a good bill and ought to become a law.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not in order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mississippi River, from the mouth of the Ohio River to and including the mouth of the Missouri River: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$350,000.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop] a moment, I would like to put this thought to him. With the construction of the Panama Canal and the reduction of rates between the two coasts, there is a section lying between the Appalachian and the Rocky Mountains which will be placed at a disadvantage in rates as compared with the two coasts not so favorable as heretofore enjoyed. The Interstate Commerce Commission in the adjustment of rates by rail will not be able to give to the Mississippi Valley that relief to which it may think itself entitled and to which perhaps it is justly entitled. That great section, including the great agricultural State of Iowa, must look to some source in order that by an equalization and adjustment of rates the agricultural products and the manufactured products of the State of Iowa may find their way to market. The only relief which will be open to them will be the great Mississippi River and its tributaries, and it will be up to the producers, agricultural and manufacturing, of his great State and others of those great Central States similarly situated to utilize these waterways by the establishment of water traffic, and their outlet, their gateway to the commerce of the world, will be the city of New Orleans. And the time will come, and these gentlemen from the great State of Iowa will realize it, that States which now think, by reason of their interior location, they are not interested in the improvement of our interior waterways, will turn to them as the only source of relief in the distribution of their products to their natural market, which they must find if they would maintain their present degree of prosperity.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago when I had the floor the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT] was making a short statement, and I would like if he will kindly complete that statement, as I understand he can do so in a moment.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, that part of the statement, which time did not permit me to put in the Record, is as follows:

Our national exports were valued at \$2,431,004,047, of which \$1,735,101,131 were sent out through the port of New York. Of a total foreign commerce, valued at \$3,711,073,713, the share falling to the port of New York amounted to \$2,772,548,473. In other words, New York's export and import trade amounted to more than 74 per cent of the country's total. I am speaking of foreign commerce only.

I do not know whether the gentleman referred to tonnage of ships or merchandise, but I hold in my hand an extract from the Statistical Record, issued by the Department of Commerce, in which it is stated that during the year 1913 the total tonnage on vessels which entered and cleared the port of New York was 28,834,780 tons, and for the improvement of that portion of New York Harbor which the tonnage represented by those ves-

sels used the Federal Government has appropriated in total only \$13,538,840.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman state the year for which those figures were given?

Mr. HULBERT. For 1913. For 1914 it was 27,445,963 tons, and for 1915 it was 26,056,658. Of course since the European war broke out there are three trans-Atlantic steamship lines, formerly operating out of New York, which have been compelled to discontinue, and others are paralyzed by destruction of ships or their appropriation by the British Government. But I will offer a statement from the New York Journal of Commerce of January 3, 1916, showing improved conditions nevertheless:

FOUR THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTEEN SHIPS SAILED FOR FOREIGN PORTS—YEAR'S CLEARANCES GREATER THAN IN 1914 AND 1913—WHILE THE VESSELS IN FOREIGN COMMERCE INCREASED IN NUMBER, THEIR AGGREGATE TONNAGE WAS SMALLER, DUE TO THE ELIMINATION OF LARGE PASSENGER STEAMERS FROM OCEAN TRAFFIC—COMPARATIVE FIGURES FOR THREE YEARS.

Despite the European war and the elimination of German and Austrian steamships from the foreign commerce, the number of vessels entering the port of New York during the past calendar year was larger than the total for 1914 and the total for 1913. On the other hand, the tonnage of the vessels entering and clearing from this port was considerably smaller than in the two previous years.

Following is a summary of the tonnage of vessels in New York's foreign commerce for the past three years, compiled by the customhouse authorities:

	1913	1914	1915
Number of vessels entered.....	4,448	4,206	4,890
Number of vessels cleared.....	4,203	4,042	4,915
Tonnage of vessels entered.....	15,410,977	13,894,486	12,962,428
Tonnage of vessels cleared.....	15,167,801	13,551,477	13,094,230

The increase in the past year in the number of ships sailing from New York for foreign ports is largely due to the tremendous increase in merchandise exports, the total value of which amounted to \$1,783,372,810, which is greater by \$25,000,000 than the combined exports of 1913 and 1914.

The decrease in the aggregate tonnage is due to the fact that ocean steamers of the type of the *Olympic*, *Mauretania*, and *Vaterland* have not been engaged in the regular service owing to the war, many of the steamers of this class having been requisitioned by foreign Governments.

It is also to be noted that there has been a considerable increase in the number of vessels in our foreign commerce despite the fact that German and Austrian vessels have not entered or cleared at this port since the outbreak of the European war, about 17 months ago.

Following table gives the detailed figures, by months, of the entrance and clearance of vessels for the past three years:

Month.	Entered.		Cleared.	
	Number of vessels.	Tonnage.	Number of vessels.	Tonnage.
January.....	317	1,096,105	319	1,199,997
February.....	288	1,048,225	277	1,062,375
March.....	313	1,189,732	314	1,232,040
April.....	368	1,365,344	321	1,240,665
May.....	377	1,280,043	361	1,332,597
June.....	402	1,341,416	342	1,262,882
July.....	431	1,358,475	408	1,317,028
August.....	437	1,360,781	425	1,378,232
September.....	432	1,449,209	383	1,308,366
October.....	373	1,403,158	377	1,440,913
November.....	330	1,156,666	320	1,143,471
December.....	380	1,361,923	356	1,253,135
Total.....	4,448	15,410,977	4,203	15,167,801

Month.	Entered.		Cleared.	
	Number of vessels.	Tonnage.	Number of vessels.	Tonnage.
January.....	294	1,106,633	305	1,188,646
February.....	269	1,027,721	261	1,027,803
March.....	344	1,292,750	326	1,276,537
April.....	385	1,448,064	346	1,311,423
May.....	375	1,352,924	377	1,374,060
June.....	425	1,449,985	389	1,406,412
July.....	425	1,429,355	411	1,345,228
August.....	357	1,044,579	293	795,926
September.....	353	975,256	343	1,034,664
October.....	340	977,828	366	994,247
November.....	337	913,722	299	860,442
December.....	301	875,669	326	936,085
Total.....	4,206	13,894,486	4,042	13,551,477

1915.

Month.	Entered.		Cleared.	
	Number vessels.	Tonnage.	Number vessels.	Tonnage.
January.....	310	923,365	307	937,304
February.....	293	910,030	309	878,653
March.....	371	1,049,215	357	1,006,740
April.....	461	1,219,141	412	1,094,019
May.....	421	1,079,497	416	1,119,691
June.....	491	1,249,956	453	1,188,367
July.....	430	1,079,982	469	1,157,293
August.....	430	1,084,091	416	1,046,859
September.....	428	1,055,835	423	1,115,292
October.....	437	1,119,803	451	1,142,744
November.....	441	1,191,222	466	1,202,739
December.....	377	1,000,292	445	1,233,529
Total.....	4,890	12,962,428	4,915	13,094,230

¹ Estimated.

The total tonnage of the vessels engaged in foreign trade with the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, was 46,710,406 for all ports. In 1914 the total for the country was 53,388,577.

The total exports from the port of New York for the week ending March 11, 1916, were \$60,204,165. For the corresponding week for 1915 the total exports were only \$40,864,337 and for the corresponding week in the year 1914 the total was only \$20,945,607. Now, we do not claim that because of these figures—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman did not give the freight tonnage for the year 1915.

Mr. HULBERT. I can not give it to you accurately, but it is approximately 100,000,000 tons, having a value of \$6,000,000,000 per annum.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman can not cite us to any authoritative record showing 100,000,000 tons of freight.

Mr. HULBERT. The only authority I can cite is the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, as to the tonnage of the whole port of New York. I can cite the gentleman the figures in regard to the foreign commerce in tons at New York, because that information is obtainable from the customhouse.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. What are those figures?

Mr. HULBERT. I have not got them at hand, but I will be very glad to produce them and put them into the Record. But the total domestic or coastwise trade I can not give the gentleman, because there is no provision of law by which it can be collected, analyzed, and published. I now have such a bill in course of preparation and intend to introduce it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I would like to have some of my time left.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words; and I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for the purpose of an inquiry.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments close in five minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That would be sufficient, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes, following the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then I will ask to extend it to 10 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT] desire recognition?

Mr. HULBERT. I will ask recognition in order that my colleague [Mr. MILLER] may ask me a question, if he desires to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit me in his time to make a brief statement, completing the statement he made?

Mr. HULBERT. If it relates to the statement I made, I have no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I wish in addition, Mr. Chairman, to call attention to the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. Unquestionably the greatest

commercial port in the world is the city of New York; the greatest in the world. Unquestionably the second greatest port in the world, so far as tonnage is concerned, is the Duluth-Superior Harbor, at the western extremity of Lake Superior.

Oh, I see some gentlemen smile. That smiling on their part does not do themselves very much credit. It indicates that they have not kept abreast of the times. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT] has cited the fact that the tonnage of the ships that carried the imperial commerce of New York in 1913 was 28,000,000 tons. The tonnage of the ships that carried the tonnage of Duluth-Superior Harbor in 1913 was 28,000,000 tons. That does not represent the freight tonnage carried, however. The freight tonnage for the year 1914, as was given by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], for the Duluth-Superior Harbor, is about 33,000,000 tons. The gentleman might, if he had chosen, have stated that that was the low year for many years, and that in the preceding year of 1913 the total tonnage was 46,000,000. I see, also, that its value was \$352,595,577.

Mr. HULBERT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. In a minute. The total tonnage for London that year was but 41,000,000. The tonnage for Liverpool was but 35,000,000. The tonnage of Chicago, imperial city as it was, was but 14,000,000. When we come to make comparisons as to freight and the tonnage, the Duluth-Superior Harbor ranks second to New York in the world.

Now, in harmony with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] said a short time ago—

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an inquiry there?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. In a second. We do not maintain that the appropriations for the Duluth-Superior Harbor are of exclusive benefit to Duluth and Superior any more than that the appropriations for the improvement of the Delaware River are for the exclusive benefit of the splendid city of Philadelphia. An appropriation for the harbor of Duluth-Superior is a benefit to every man in the United States who either sends something through that harbor or buys something that is sent through it. In fact, that is the great gateway to the interior of the continent, and its commerce will continue to grow with tremendous rapidity as the commerce of the country develops. Manufactured products and foreign products coming down the Great Lakes there meet the rails, and are thence transported into the interior.

A few years ago I was interested to hear a gentleman who was engaged in the Lake transportation business for 40 years, after spending a whole winter in the work, finally come to a fairly reasonable estimate as to what had been saved to the producers and consumers of America in cheapened freight by the improvements made upon the Great Lakes, and the figures that were produced by him staggered me. Men on this floor can remember distinctly when it cost 10 or 12 cents to send a bushel of wheat from Duluth to Buffalo. Now you can send that bushel of wheat anywhere for from three-quarters to one and one-half cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] falls into an error which a great many people of the country in the inland districts have fallen into. They make a comparison between all of the commerce at their local ports and the foreign commerce at one of the seaports.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. MANN. That is exactly what the gentleman did. The gentleman compares commerce of the Duluth-Superior port with the foreign commerce of New York City.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. MANN. I make the statement, and I am correct. If all the commerce of New York City was taken into consideration, it would amount to hundreds of millions of tons, computed in the same way that they compute the commerce at Chicago and through the Duluth & Superior Canal or Milwaukee or any of those places of that sort. They do not pretend to gather statistics of all the domestic commerce at New York City.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. No; I have made a correct statement, and I do not care to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I listened to my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] make his statement a little while ago, and I also heard him a little earlier in the day. I simply wanted to dispel any impression that the House might have that the gentleman from Minnesota is any different from

the most of us, that he is any more altruistic than other Members of this House.

I remember distinctly that when the Panama Canal was up for consideration the distinguished gentleman joined hands with the other side of the aisle to impose tolls upon American coastwise shipping going through that canal.

Yet the products from my portion of the country, the wheat and the lumber and the other products from the Pacific coast, go to the Atlantic coast and there compete with those from his State. The Government furnishes him a canal for his products free, and he was not so altruistic at that time but that he voted to impose a tariff upon the products coming from my portion of the country that competed with his, already handicapped by having to come a good many thousand miles farther. So I thought it might be well to state that my good friend from Minnesota, just like the rest of us, can see good in his own products. He can stand up here and praise them, and he can see faults in the others, just the same as anybody else.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does the gentleman think there is no difference between an interoceanic canal at Panama and the Sault Ste. Marie Canal connecting two bodies of water within the United States?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not a bit of difference. They were both built on American soil; the American people own both and the American flag floats over both.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the gentleman can not see any difference, I think he is the only Member of the House who can not.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. At least, I am not like some Members who first saw the thing one way and then changed their minds, and so, having been on both sides, must have been right at least once. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. Would not the gentleman expect one side of the House at least to follow the President when he flops?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; but I would hardly expect the gentleman from Minnesota to follow him.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that the President followed me. When he found he differed with me, he flopped. [Laughter.] When the bill was originally before the House I followed the lead of the distinguished committee and its chairman, and the ranking member on the Republican side, and voted for tolls, because I believed then and believe now that we ought to have tolls for going through the Panama Canal. When the President looked and found that he had had the temerity to differ with me, he promptly and expeditiously changed his views. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman enjoys it when he is wrong, and the President is wrong with him. It might be well for the gentleman sometimes to be right, even if the President differs with him.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will state that if I did, the President never would be on my side. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mississippi River from the mouth of the Missouri River to Minneapolis, Minn.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$1,200,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes. This is the only project on which I desire to speak longer than 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What project is it?

Mr. FREAR. It is my own, the upper Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I thought the gentleman was going to move to strike out the item.

Mr. FREAR. Leave that to me.

Mr. Chairman, for many days I have pressed on the attention of the House and through the Record on the country the startling fact that while this Government has been aimlessly squandering some four hundred million dollars on its creeks, canals, and rivers, while our population has increased over 200 per cent, and our country's total commerce has been quadrupled and again quadrupled, these same rivers, canals, and creeks on which hundreds of millions have been spent did not gain a ton of commerce on the average. I do not refer to several deep waterways which are in a separate class. More striking, with

rare exceptions, the rivers have lost from 50 per cent to 100 per cent of their boasted waterway commerce, and the greatest river of all, the Mississippi, on which nearly \$150,000,000 has been spent, now shows a loss estimated at 90 per cent of its once great commerce.

During several days I have presented to this committee the opinions of able economists, statesmen, waterway experts, and conscientious engineers, who unanimously agree it is folly to spend hundreds of millions more without definite purpose. Moulton, Fisher, Reid, Burton, and Col. Townsend, men familiar with waterways all over the world, have been quoted. Not one of the many experts on the subject has been answered. They are among the highest authorities in the country and are impartial students. They say we are trying to turn back the hands of time and to plow with a stick in this twentieth century.

This bill carries \$39,600,000, over half of which goes to a dozen largely deserted rivers and hopeless waterway projects, as I have pointed out in my report. It wastes other millions on a hundred and fifty other rivers and creeks contained in the bill. We have spent \$150,000,000 on the Mississippi, largely for reclamation of private lands, and all these enormous expenditures have been required in order to secure for a few actual commercial waterways needed improvements.

Mr. Chairman, for three years I have tried to present to the House the character of river and harbor bills brought before it. I do not take any credit for what has been accomplished. If my work has been of any service to the country, that is sufficient reward for the effort.

The last two river bills defeated carried over \$92,000,000. The substitutes carried \$50,000,000, or a saving of \$42,000,000. I believe far more than that amount has been saved, because the last item read in this bill is a reduction of over a half million dollars from the amount contained in the first bill defeated, an illustration of what has occurred with many other items.

Because of the demand of others that I be consistent and show good faith, I asked to go on the River and Harbor Committee for the purpose of trying to prevent waste and to suggest a better system. Needless to say, the work was not agreeable, but I wish to express my grateful acknowledgments to the chairman and members of the committee, who have treated me with every courtesy. If I have done aught to offend, personally, I trust it will be pardoned.

For three years I have been criticized and lampooned by different Members of the House because of my efforts. Believing there is no half-way course, I have refused to become involved in personalities. My motives for remaining silent, for not replying, may have been misconstrued, but I have accepted hard blows without any return because the subject is too important to be clouded by personalities. Within the past day or so the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] insisted my course was political and sectional; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] has insisted I am inconsistent and ask for myself what I criticize in others. My friend from Pennsylvania Mr. Moore charges me with lack of interest in waterways generally.

These gentlemen are among their party leaders on this floor. Many others have joined them in criticisms, but I will not reply in kind nor seek to explain. Explanations are of little avail to those who fail to comprehend that a man may stand for what he believes to be right because of honest convictions. That it has become a national disgrace, to use the words of Senator Toombs, for Congress to engage in a "miserable scramble for a slice from the Public Treasury."

I do not care to explain motives nor do I care to offer any defense for my course.

The gentleman from Alabama says it is political and sectional. Yet I denounced wasteful waterway projects in the North from Cold Spring Inlet to a dozen smaller items, and the one under discussion is equally wasteful. He says it is political. Yet my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KONOPE] will tell you that although an entire stranger to him, and a friend of his Republican opponent, Mr. Kusterman, it was my vote that gave him his seat here when the State election commission, of which I was chairman, divided two and one with only five votes in dispute.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] says I want some favors and am disappointed. Saturday I explained to the House that I refused to indorse an \$8,000,000 canalization project on the St. Croix, beside my home city. The chairman of that commission is one of my close friends from my home town. When he came to Washington I told him I could not stand for it because it was a waste of public money.

My friend Mr. Moore of Pennsylvania has said repeatedly that I do not know the importance of waterways and my work may

help railways. As to the railway proposition, I will say the railways profit by these appropriations because it helps their terminals and boat lines, and they own by far the greater number of both. For years I have sought to secure laws regulating railways and for years gave help to my distinguished colleague [Mr. LENROOT], then speaker of the Wisconsin Assembly, who was active in that same fight.

I am greatly interested in waterways. Wisconsin's waterway commerce is second only to that of New York. It has a dozen or more fine harbors on Lakes Superior and Michigan, while three of these harbors carried over 60,000,000 tons in 1913, many times the actual waterway commerce of all the Southern States put together. Wisconsin only receives \$308,000 in this bill for her harbors—less than the Brazos gets for 1,080 tons annually. So far as I know Wisconsin has all she needs for present projects, but over a million dollars in this one bill given to the Brazos, Arkansas, and Ouachita alone is all wasted.

In addition to the two greatest lakes in the world, the greatest river in the world is on our borders. One hundred miles runs along my own district. Years ago I remember when the Mississippi and the St. Croix were covered with large boats and a great commerce. That was before the advent of railways. Today there is only a shadow of the old commerce. After spending over \$20,000,000 on the upper Mississippi, it is not in as good shape, according to river pilots, as 40 years ago, although it can still float the largest river boats on a 41-foot depth throughout the season. Some of the people of my district were at first opposed to my fight against these bills. A Government boat yard in my district was stirred by outside influences until I went to the city in which the yard is situated to say that if they wanted their Member to vote for such wasteful bills they must send some one else here. I carried that city at the next election by a larger vote than before. The people of Wisconsin as well as the people from Texas, whose commending letters I have read, are honest. They do not believe in this wasteful bill.

Mr. Chairman, the upper Mississippi receives \$1,200,000 in this bill. After deducting sand, gravel, brush, Government construction material, and floatable timber, the commerce on the 600-mile stretch reached about 170,000 tons in 1913, and that was floated a distance on the average of less than 50 miles.

Six thousand automobiles and some live stock ferried across the river composed two-thirds of the commerce value shown by the engineers' reports; 770,000 tons of sand, gravel, brush, and so forth, used by the Government for river dams and construction, were added into the 1913 commerce report. That commerce report is a public scandal. Misleading commerce reports have been repeatedly exposed, and Col. Townsend now admits the loss of traffic on the upper Mississippi is about 90 per cent. St. Paul and Minneapolis are cities of 600,000 inhabitants. St. Louis has a greater population. A score of other cities are along the river; but all the actual commerce on that river to-day is only a joke, compared with millions of tons carried by railways along its banks. Promises of future commerce are equally hopeless. When Bernhard, the boat builder, asked what commerce St. Paul merchants could drum up for his line, the committee secured promises for only 12,000 tons—two or three trainloads in one year—that was all.

Waste on the lower Mississippi is a matter of national importance, but on the upper river it is equally inexcusable.

I desire to offer an amendment cutting the proposed appropriation in two, giving \$600,000 to the 600 upper miles. Friends tell me that those who resent criticisms of the bill will unite to pass my amendment; but, if so, it will only serve to bring before the country the weakness of the present pork-barrel system. I believe that appropriation should be cut to actual maintenance. Col. Townsend so recommends; and it is in the direction of public economy.

The entire bill should be cut in two by striking out most of the appropriations now going into useless and hopeless rivers and canals.

Is my amendment an answer to criticisms? If not, I shall not dodge the issue. I refuse to be influenced by a \$1,200,000 Mississippi River appropriation next my district or by any \$8,000,000 canalization to run past my home town, or by any amount that may be given to my own State in this or any other bill. Every legitimate waterway should be improved; but I am not willing to stifle my judgment nor my conscience to vote for a vicious bill like the one before us. I am not questioning motives of those who do so; but, when you criticize my action, I say to you that I will not be a party to the "miserable scramble" spoken of by Bob. Toombs. What is more, I hope to do all I can in a small way to expose the character of this bill and to try to point the way to a better system.

Mr. Chairman, criticism of Congress is invited by this bill. We can affect to be righteously indignant over that criticism, but the fault is ours. I hope and expect a substitute will be adopted that will relieve the Treasury from the burden imposed by this bill. I do not trust the unrestricted judgment of Army Engineers, but, acting under a bad system without any possibility of immediate improvement, it seems the only alternative if we would save \$20,000,000 in wasted money. I have offered this amendment seriously. I have offered many other amendments that have been defeated. This one will save \$600,000; and if we pass a reasonable substitute bill we will save \$20,000,000, the cost of a great battleship, while no legitimate waterway in the country need suffer from this bill's defeat.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement of the commerce report of the river, and also a statement made by Mr. Bernhard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks leave to extend his remarks by including the data indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ST. PAUL TO ST. LOUIS—ANOTHER COUNT IN THE INDICTMENT.

The next stretch on the Mississippi River is from St. Paul to St. Louis, and the Chief Engineer, on April 1, 1915, apparently in order to hand over nearly \$5,000,000 to the lower river in 1915, threw a round million into this part of the upper river. In January, 1915, \$444,274 remained on hand for this section, according to Senate Document 953, Sixty-third Congress. What justification was offered for spending nearly \$2,000 per mile in one year on this stretch of the river? What commerce is served?

Keeping in mind that actual commerce on the river has probably decreased 95 per cent during the past few years, during which time \$20,000,000 of Government funds has been dumped into this 600-mile stretch during that period, let us see how the Chief of Engineers excuses an allotment in 1915 of an even million in addition to the balance on hand and in addition to approximately \$30,000 per mile already spent on this project. Examine his statement of commerce, taken from page 2437 of the Chief Engineer's report for 1914. It will not be found easily in the Index.

The report says the quantity of freight carried by all boats, including the rock and brush used in Government work and also including logs and lumber floated down the stream, is as follows, and then follows a table, of which 772,392 tons hauled 9,445,576 ton-miles, valued at \$781,897, is for material used by the Government in improving the river.

Upper Mississippi River freight statement for 1913.

Designation.	Short tons.	Ton-miles.	Valuation.
Logs.....	64,489	30,245,340	\$315,271
Rafted lumber, shingles, etc.....	13,570	4,400,147	190,001
Miscellaneous freight.....	1,294,864	12,229,310	31,417,968
United States material.....	772,392	9,445,576	781,897
Total.....	2,145,315	56,320,373	32,705,137

Classified freight traffic, 1913.

Articles.	Amount.		Valuation.	Average haul.	Ton-miles.
	Customary units.	Short tons.			
Apples.....	100,090 barrels.....	11,505	\$200,218	34.4	395,959
Automobiles.....	5,703.....	6,034	9,545,950	3.8	23,014
Brick.....	192,190 pieces.....	981	3,052	7.3	7,157
Brush.....	656,644 cubic yards.....	82,450	170,191	20.6	1,700,994
Cement.....	4,205 tons.....	4,305	24,378	9.9	425,790
Coal.....	28,238 tons.....	26,236	90,400	13.5	354,401
Corn.....	119,000 bushels.....	3,463	77,431	6.4	22,144
Farm produce.....	13,565 tons.....	13,565	359,319	23.5	315,900
Fish.....	6,539 tons.....	6,539	666,600	9.8	62,486
Gravel.....	268,103 cubic yards.....	398,179	195,242	9.1	3,621,435
Hay.....	2,615 tons.....	2,615	44,269	5.4	14,122
Lath.....	3,056,000 pieces.....	1,018	10,575	317.2	322,989
Live stock.....	58,951 head.....	28,713	5,218,730	6.6	190,202
Logs.....	8,904,380 feet b. m.....	98,268	463,631	316.2	31,074,221
Lumber.....	19,167,689 feet b. m.....	30,408	467,775	138.0	4,195,827
Merchandise.....	17,101 tons.....	17,101	2,107,830	126.9	217,089
Oats.....	3,550 bushels.....	55	1,775	1.0	55
Rock.....	535,143 cubic yards.....	708,066	562,077	11.3	7,976,674
Sand.....	430,173 cubic yards.....	562,040	209,143	4.7	2,653,545
Shells.....	11,428 tons.....	11,428	246,229	42.9	490,801
Shingles.....	622,000 pieces.....	65	1,866	1.3	85
Teams.....	23,501.....	26,609	6,540,900	1.7	46,537
Wheat.....	11,500 bushels.....	382	12,347	7.9	3,015
Wood.....	21,847 cords.....	34,248	108,213	16.4	560,865
Miscellaneous.....	71,042 tons.....	71,042	5,386,996	231.0	1,642,366
Total.....		2,145,315	32,705,137	26.2	56,322,373

A comparative statement of upper river commerce is also offered by years, during which period between \$20,000,000 and \$25,000,000 have been expended by the Government on the advice of Army engineers. While the 1913 commerce was only about 35 per cent of that floated in 1885, it will be ascertained upon analysis that over nine-tenths of the 35 per cent floated in 1913 is bogus commerce, or, assuming the 1885 commerce reported to have been legitimate, in 28 years river freight fell approximately 96 per cent.

Mississippi River: Mouth of the Missouri to St. Paul, Minn.
[From reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department.]

	Tonnage.
1885.....	5,607,196
1886.....	3,200,000
1887.....	3,500,000
1888.....	3,750,000
1889.....	3,500,000
1890.....	4,200,000
1891.....	3,800,000
1892.....	3,750,000
1893.....	3,200,000
1894.....	2,975,000
1895.....	3,000,000
1896.....	2,250,000
1897.....	3,200,000
1898.....	2,800,000
1899.....	2,900,000
1900.....	2,400,000
1901.....	2,125,000
1902.....	1,900,000
1903.....	4,545,129
1904.....	4,534,539
1905.....	4,089,318
1906.....	3,847,319
1907.....	2,581,857
1908.....	1,916,114
1909.....	1,836,035
1910.....	2,081,566
1911.....	1,830,294
1912.....	2,145,315
1913.....	2,145,315

[From reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, 1904, vol. 2, p. 2157, and 1913, vol. 2, p. 2385.]

	Tonnage.
Average tonnage for years 1877 to 1903, inclusive.....	4,615,376
Tonnage in 1912.....	1,830,294

Decrease..... 2,785,082

Referring to the 1913 statement, let us briefly examine the items, which show some remarkable facts.

ENGINEER'S STATISTICS OF COMMERCE (?).

"Commerce" reached 2,145,315 tons in 1913, so the Chief of Engineers reports. Tons of what? Let us see:

	Tons.
Brush for river construction work.....	82,450
Gravel dredged from river.....	398,178
Rock for river work.....	708,000
Sand dredged from river.....	562,000
Logs that have floated for 50 years.....	98,268
Lumber and wood barged.....	64,408
Animals ferried across river.....	55,322
Automobiles ferried across river.....	6,034
Total.....	1,974,980

All could be floated in 2 or 3 feet of water, leaving 170,335 tons of questionable commerce remaining, which was hauled on an average of 26 miles or thereabouts.

What a legislative travesty when eleven-twelfths of the commerce for which \$1,000,000 was allotted by the Chief of Engineers is of that character. Who weighed the brush? Who weighed the logs? Who weighed the rocks, gravel, sand, and so forth, used in the river work? Where was it carried, and for what purpose? Was it floated 1 mile or 10 miles? Who knows? Why measure Government material for river work anyway?

A WONDERFUL SYSTEM IN VALUING "COMMERCE."

The Chief of Engineers says that 26,609 tons of horses were carried a mile and a half across the river and their value was \$6,540,900, or one-fifth of the total. Other live stock carried across the river, he says, was valued at \$5,218,730; and then, to cap the climax, this report adds that 6,034 tons of automobiles ferried across the river were valued at \$9,545,950.

Nearly two-thirds of all the glowing commerce valuations on the upper Mississippi, including Government sand, rock, and gravel, turns out to be animals and automobiles ferried across the river.

Again, how much of the remaining 170,000 tons was repair material or Government supplies out of a total 772,000 tons reported? How much was duplicated before it could boost a million-dollar allotment for the upper river?

The following statement is from a discussion on Rivers and Railroads in the United States by J. H. Bernhard, associate member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, in the proceedings of that society, August, 1915:

A mistake is made by the public in assuming that it is always the river channel that causes this idleness. Nothing could be further from the truth. To-day the Mississippi, from St. Louis to its mouth, affords a channel which is the best to be found on any stream in the world, unless one takes the Amazon or the Congo into account; and see its emptiness. An 8-foot channel is all that the most efficient service requires. The Government works unremittingly to develop waterways, only to see the water-borne traffic on inland rivers grow less as the years go by, not due chiefly to the inadequate depth of the channels, but to this rate-making anarchism; and until the idea that the principal function of inland water channels is to regulate the rates for rail transportation has been untaught, or made unnecessary by just rates, we will not see great river traffic.

Still the average "riverman" will insist that the poor condition of the channels keeps our inland waters idle. This is preposterous; the Rhine could never compare with the Mississippi in its advantages for transportation; its channel is narrower and shallower, more changeable; the current is swifter; and ice is known in the winter over its entire navigable length to its very mouth, yet in 1913 more than 97,000 vessels passed the Dutch and German frontier on the Rhine, which means a vessel every five minutes for the entire year.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FREAR: Page 28, line 19, strike out "\$1,200,000" and insert "\$600,000."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, as I have stated, that practically provides for \$1,000 a mile, not quite as much as the stretch of the river below. It is just the same as was proposed for the lower Mississippi. It seems to me that ought to take care of the maintenance.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FREAR) there were—ayes 30, noes 35.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to come in as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 28, after line 19, insert the following as a new paragraph: "That the Chief of Engineers, or such board as the Secretary of War may appoint, shall, within two years after the passage of this act, make such experiments in the transportation of heavy freights on said Mississippi River between the mouth of the Ohio River and St. Louis and between Dubuque, Iowa, and Minneapolis, Minn., at all stages of water in said river, with the experimental tows and barges described in House Document No. 857, Sixty-third Congress, second session, as will fully demonstrate the economy or lack of economy in the transportation of such heavy freights, and particularly upstream in parts of said river in which said improvement has been completed or practically completed, and for the making of such experiments said Chief of Engineers or board is hereby authorized to use not to exceed \$50,000 of the unexpended balance of the \$500,000 appropriated by the act of June 25, 1910, for designing and constructing experimental tow boats and barges and loading and unloading facilities for towing and delivering supplies along the Mississippi River and its tributaries."

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, by this amendment I desire to put life into a provision of the river and harbor act approved June 25, 1910. The provision I have reference to is as follows:

The Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of War, is hereby authorized to design and construct two experimental towboats of modern but different types, with a complement of suitable barges and necessary loading and unloading facilities, for towing and delivering supplies along the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and in making designs for such boats the said Chief of Engineers shall investigate and consider types of boats in use for similar purposes on nontidal rivers in this and other countries, and for the purposes of such investigation, designs, and construction there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$500,000.

That became law in 1910. Immediately after the passage of that law the Chief of Engineers appointed a commission of experts on August 6, 1910. That commission was given the following work to do:

Consideration of devices for river transportation, experiments upon model towboats and barges, experiments upon paddlewheels, investigation of methods in use on European rivers, consideration of cargo-handling appliances, discussion and determination of designs of experimental towboats and barges.

That was in August, 1910. That commission began its work, and in the course of its work a subcommittee of the commission went to Europe to investigate the question of river navigation in various countries. As a result of that investigation this commission found:

That European methods of towing are in general not suitable for use on the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

They also found that towing by tow line, the European mode, is not considered practicable upon our western rivers on account of the physical conditions of these waterways and on account of the necessity of having a crew on each barge.

This commission appointed in August, 1910, did not make a report until February 20, 1914. When it did report it recommended the adoption of certain types of tows and barges, the construction of one fleet of six No. 2 deck barges, another fleet of six No. 4 open barges. It also recommended that the hulls should be made of steel, that two towboats be of the stern-wheel type and two of the twin screws in tunnels, with a beam of 43 feet and 34 feet, respectively, and length between per-

pendiculars 170 feet, and draft 4 feet in both cases, with other recommendations which I have set out and designated in my amendment. The information given to Congress in this report of February 20, 1914, was quite complete. A year ago I offered a similar amendment to the river and harbor bill, but in that I provided that the \$50,000 should be taken out of the \$1,200,000 provided for the upper river. In the present amendment I ask that \$50,000 is to be taken out of the \$475,000 that is still available and is to be used for experiments. I do not deduct this sum of \$50,000 from the improvement fund for the upper river but segregate \$50,000 out of the \$475,000 that is still available.

I have stated that according to the engineers the European methods of river navigation are of little value to us in this country, therefore we must adopt types or models of tows and barges suited to our home conditions. Hence the necessity for this commission making a report at as early a date as possible in response to the direction of Congress made in 1910.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I am thoroughly in accord with the gentleman as to the necessity of this experiment on the type of boats for river navigation. That has been one of the great drawbacks to river navigation up to the present time. But does the gentleman understand that these experiments have been carried on for the last three years on the Missouri River until we have developed a type of barge that answers the purpose?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; but the Missouri River boats are a double-tunnel type like the *Scott* and *Advance* and have a horsepower of 600, while this type recommended by the commission is to have a horsepower of 1,200, and the conditions of operation would be quite different.

These models that the engineers have recommended are the result of experiments of six months duration by Prof. Sadler, in an experimental tank at the University of Michigan. His experiments were with toy models. We want the barges and towboats actually constructed and actually used in the upper Mississippi River in order to determine whether they can meet the conditions of navigation in the upper river—whether they can take one barge loaded at 880 tons, that is the tonnage capacity per barge recommended—or two barges or three barges or four barges or a maximum of six barges; whether they can meet the conditions of low-water navigation, whether they can meet the dangerous cross currents in the upper river caused by the construction of winged dams. These are some of the problems that can not be solved except by actual construction of the towboats and barges and not by any mere model operated in experimental tanks.

I have stated that the experiments must be made within two years. That is ample time. We have waited six years and have not yet gotten the model tows and barges constructed nor have we made any experiments therewith. My amendment gives two more years in order that this may be done. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, it has occurred to me, as he says, will give some life to this provision, which was carried in the river and harbor bill a few years ago. The appointment of a commission to examine and if possible find some means whereby the upper Mississippi River can be navigated by certain types of boats so as to carry freight on that river at a stage of the river which is usually shallow. I do not know whether under the authorization the commission will go ahead and carry it out or not, but I do believe that something ought to be done to construct these boats. But it seems to me that if they do not do so this amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] ought to be incorporated in the bill, so that we will have some definite result. For that reason I have thought that the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin ought to prevail and will vote for it unless it can be shown otherwise.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in my judgment, is wholly unnecessary. The river and harbor act of 1910 carried a provision similar to the one the gentleman has offered here, and since that time the engineers of the War Department have been experimenting and making a study of a type of boat to be used on the Mississippi and other rivers of the country. They have about completed their study, so far as that is concerned, and have made a report. That report, as was stated by the gentleman a moment ago, was made March 20, 1914, a little more than two years ago, but quite recently I had a conversation with the Chief of Engineers, who told me that they were going ahead under that provision and would in a

short time have one or two boats constructed and ready for use. I do not think they expect to go into the business very extensively, may not perhaps expend all of the money appropriated for the purpose, but sufficiently to complete the experiment and to be able to make a satisfactory report to Congress of the results of their experiments. I do not think this amendment will hurt anything, but it will, in my opinion, do no good.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, when this matter was up a year ago the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] said he had called the matter to the attention of the Chief of Engineers at that time, and one year has elapsed since that time, and the situation is the same as before. Why not put a little "pep" into the proposition?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think this discussion will have that effect, if such an effect is needed, just as much as would the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

Mississippi River from St. Paul to Minneapolis, Minn.: Completing improvement, \$170,000.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by inserting as a new paragraph, on page 28, line 21, after the figures "\$170,000," the following:

"That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to make and enter into an agreement with the Municipal Electric Co., a public corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota, for the purpose of utilizing the hydroelectric power developed by the surplus waters not needed for navigation by the dam prescribed and provided for in House Document No. 741, Sixty-first Congress, second session, as adopted by Congress in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes,' approved June 25, 1910. Such agreement shall provide that for the privileges secured thereby said corporation shall pay to the United States the fair and proportional cost of maintenance of said dam, lands, and appurtenant works, and also pay in addition an annual sum, not less than 3 per cent, upon such amount as the United States shall have invested and expended in the completion of the project by which such water power is developed and maintained over and above the amount actually expended and which would have been expended in completion of the project for navigation only. Such amount shall be determined by the records in the office of the Chief of Engineers, and the said annual payments for rent and maintenance shall be made on or before the 2d day of January of each year; and the rent shall begin with the use of the power commercially by the said Municipal Electric Corporation, and not later than one year after said company has been notified by the Secretary of War that the water is available.

"The right shall be reserved to the United States and included in such contract for the United States to purchase and use such supply of said power as may be required for its own purposes on the same terms and conditions as the said power is sold or distributed to the members of said public corporation of the State of Minnesota."

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer, while a little long, is one that has been considered by Congress before. In the Sixty-second Congress it passed the Senate, and it was introduced in the House as a bill in the second session of the Sixty-second Congress, and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. It was also introduced in the Sixty-third Congress and referred to the same committee. It was first introduced in the Senate by my distinguished colleague, Senator NELSON. It is in the exact language as the amendment adopted in the river and harbor appropriation bill in the Senate in the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. We would like to know, for information, whether there is surplus power that will be developed from that dam?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Yes; there will 15,000, maximum, horsepower.

Mr. BORLAND. And is this company that is seeking to lease the power a municipal lighting company?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. It is the Municipal Electric Co., so named, created under the laws of our State and composed of the president of the board of regents of the University of Minnesota and the mayor of the city of Minneapolis and the mayor of the city of St. Paul.

Mr. BORLAND. It is, in effect, a municipal corporation?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. It is not a private corporation?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Oh, no.

Mr. BORLAND. It is a corporation formed by the two cities and the State University.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. It is a municipal corporation, incorporated for the purpose of furnishing light to the city of

Minneapolis and to the city of St. Paul and to the State University, and to the four Federal buildings in those two cities and to Fort Snelling. I want to say further that while this amendment provides that the Municipal Electric Co. is to get the lease of the hydroelectric power developed by the surplus water not needed for navigation at this dam should it be determined that the Federal Government needs the whole or any part of this power the Municipal Electric Co. must furnish it to the Government at cost. The Federal Government is to have the first lien and the right to the power, and what is left after the Government is supplied goes to the two cities for street lighting and for other public purposes, and to the State University.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is this a corporation organized for profit or simply to serve the public?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. This is a corporation without profit. It is simply to serve the State of Minnesota, and the two cities, and the United States Government without any profit to any one. The officers and the directors of the association, it is specifically provided in the law shall receive no salary. They have a right to employ such managers and engineers as would be necessary to carry on the business, but there is no profit anywhere.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to introduce at this time a copy of the law under which this corporation was created and also the charter which has been granted to it, and I wish also to introduce the application that is now on file in the War Department with reference to the project. I also wish to have read by the Clerk a statement made by Gen. Bixby, Chief of Engineers, at the time Senator NELSON's amendment, of which this is an exact copy, was under consideration in the Senate, stating the reason why he thought this amendment was a proper amendment and should be passed. I also wish to say before the Clerk reads the statement that at the time that statement was made by Gen. Bixby the charter of the Municipal Electric Co. was not on file in the War Department, but that since that time it has been furnished to the War Department.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
January 8, 1913.

To the SECRETARY OF WAR:

1. Returned.
2. In the river and harbor act of June 25, 1910, Congress adopted a modified project for the improvement of Mississippi River from St. Paul to Minneapolis, set forth in House Document No. 741, Sixty-first Congress, second session.
3. The project for this improvement, then under way, provided for the construction of two locks and dams for the purpose of securing a navigable depth of 6 feet at low water. The principal feature of the modified project was the substitution of a single high dam for the two low dams provided for in the original project, such substitution being considered desirable for the reason that a high dam would provide better facilities for navigation, giving a navigable depth of 9 feet, and would also create a valuable water power which could be utilized to pay the cost of construction as well as of future maintenance and operation. The whole scheme of improvement, including the proposed utilization of the water power developed, is clearly set forth in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 3, 1910, printed in the aforesaid document to which attention is respectfully invited.
4. While the work was to be executed by the Federal Government solely at its own expense in order that the absolute control of the water power and the unqualified right to dispose of it might rest in the United States, it was considered that the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis would be the most desirable lessees of such power, and it was clearly intended that these two municipalities should be given preference in the matter. The purpose of the bill under consideration is to give effect to this intention.
5. The bill directs the Secretary of War to contract with the Municipal Electric Co., understood to be a public corporation of which the two cities are members, for the use of the power developed at the dam by the water not required for navigation. It is deemed proper to say, however, that the foregoing statement regarding the corporation named in the bill is merely an assumption, as there is no information as to its status on the records of this department. If amended as indicated in red thereon, it is believed that the bill will amply provide for the protection of the public interest, and no objection is seen to its favorable consideration by Congress.

W. H. BIXBY,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

IN THE MATTER OF THE HIGH DAM BETWEEN MINNEAPOLIS AND ST. PAUL,
MINN.—APPLICATION FOR PERMIT AND LEASE.

HON. LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War:

Application is herewith made to the Secretary of War, on behalf of the Municipal Electric Co., of the State of Minnesota, composed of the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis and the University of the State of Minnesota, for the early grant to it of permit and lease for use of the surplus water power to be developed by the operation of the Government dam in the Mississippi River between the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Reference is made to the fact that there exist circumstances connected with the authorization and erection of the dam in question and

the use of the water power therefrom, which call for peculiar consideration to be shown by the Government to these municipalities in respect to such water power.

These considerations are as follows:

I.

1. That the proposed power project and its use lie wholly within the State of Minnesota.

2. That the Government dam being in a 90 per cent state of completion, there is call for early action if these petitioning communities are to be considered at all at the hands of Government.

3. That the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul from the inception of this Government project expected and petitioned for rights of use of power to be developed thereby, as appears by action taken May 6, 1901, by the Board of Park Commissioners of the former city, as follows:

"In response to communication of Maj. D. W. Lockwood transmitting correspondence with the United States Government relative to the conveyance of land for lock and dam at Minnehaha Park, the board authorized deed to the Government of land asked for, and resolved that with the deed be transmitted the annexed resolution.

"Resolved (by the Board of Park Commissioners of the city of Minneapolis), That the board hereby represents to the United States Government that if any water power shall ever be developed in connection with one or both of the two dams to be constructed by the Government in the Mississippi River, between Minnehaha Creek and St. Anthony Falls, the city of Minneapolis ought to be entitled, and in good morals is entitled, to one-half of such power for public use, by virtue of the donation of public lands by the city for such dams and flowage rights in connection therewith, and this board does respectfully petition and memorialize the Government not to grant or lease said one-half of such power to anyone except the city of Minneapolis."

4. That the river improvement in question, including the dam incident thereto, as now constructed, has been prosecuted by authority of Congress (since the abandonment of the plan under the Report of Engineers, H. Doc. 341), wholly in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 3, 1910, House document 741, which was adopted by the Sixty-first Congress, second session, chapter 382, Vol. 36, United States Statutes at Large, No. 1, page 659.

5. That throughout such engineer's report (document 741), so adopted by Congress, there clearly appears a governmental purpose that there should be granted in some form to the Twin Cities priority of use in the water power planned for and recommended in such report.

The report, in paragraphs 32 to 41, recommends the legislation afterwards enacted by Congress, with the provision in paragraph 38, as follows: "Provided that the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis shall pay to the United States an annual rental of \$10,000, etc., etc."

6. That the special Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on February 14, 1910, in the same document conclude the adoption of the foregoing report and in such second indorsement of this project modify paragraph 40 thereof to read as follows:

"That in compliance with the conditions recited the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis be granted permission to erect a power house and install such plant as shall be necessary for the development of power and to maintain and operate such plant and to dispose of said power for a period of 50 years, etc."

7. That in paragraph 24 of such document it was recommended that the cities be allowed until July 1, 1911, to obtain legislative sanction for the undertaking of this power project.

8. That in pursuance of such municipal plan the Legislature of Minnesota on April 13, 1911, passed an act authorizing municipal hydroelectric plants. (Exhibit I hereto attached.)

9. That under such authorization there was organized in the interests of the public the Municipal Electric Co. on behalf of the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis and the University of the State of Minnesota. (Exhibit II hereto attached.)

10. That conveyances of land as requested by the Government for lock and dam and for flowage rights have been made or tendered by the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis and the University of the State of Minnesota with the reasonable expectation of priority of consideration in the matter of future water power; and

That the Government throughout the project, as modified, so seems definitely to confirm such expectation.

11. That in accordance with the request made to the cities in document 741, these cities stand tendering the Government a large acreage of most valuable land (in the case of Minneapolis park land valued at the least at \$35,000) which will be overflowed by the operation of the dam.

Such overflow is also likely in the future to entail upon these municipalities a large outlay for trunk sewer changes for the disposal of sewerage, which expense in the case of Minneapolis alone is estimated by the city engineer and the chairman of the committee on sewers, will possibly reach the sum of \$750,000.

In the case of the city of St. Paul the destruction of a large area of wooded park land is involved. The trees have already been removed therefrom, and the resultant damage to that city's park system is estimated at \$50,000. In addition there is necessitated an outlay for sewer changes which will probably reach the sum of \$500,000.

It is further urged on behalf of St. Paul that the construction of the dam does not materially benefit that city so far as navigation is concerned, and that the principal benefit to it will be resultant upon participation in the use of electric energy generated by such Government construction.

II.

1. That the Minnesota statute under the terms of which the Municipal Electric Co. has been organized was passed to conform to the suggestions deemed necessary or expedient in the Government report cited and, as shown, within the limitation of time imposed.

2. That such statutory enactment is in accordance with the special situation and wholly conserves the public interest; and

As for competitive bids under some other plan keeping down the energy cost to the public, it is insisted that the public interest is wholly conserved by the limitation in rates for electrical energy in such enactment, "to cost, maintenance, and a reasonable emergency fund, and no more."

3. That the purpose of the acquisition of this power is solely in the interest of the public of these two cities and their great university; and That by the charter of the Municipal Electric Co. formed under such enactment, such corporation is limited in the scope of its objects to the furnishing of electric energy to "Federal and State institutions and to the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul."

4. That for the purpose of conserving the public interest the "Municipal Electric Co." is an instrumentality of the State of Minnesota with responsible functions of a State utilities commission in this regard, and that for it in the Minnesota act the rate is fixed, as cited.

5. That the situation of these cities is wholly unique; that in all fairness and equity there seems clear ground under all the circumstances here for governmental preference in the bestowal of power privileges.

The Government's expressed purpose and the hope and expectation throughout these years of St. Paul and Minneapolis of its fulfillment, and the grants made and tendered by them in its furtherance, give them, it is deemed, special claim to early and affirmative action by the Government awarding to them these power rights.

Such award should be made irrespective of any comprehensive plan of power disposal devised, or to be devised, so long subsequent to the plan announced by the Government for these two cities in connection with this project.

FRED B. SNYDER,
President of the Board of Regents of the
University of Minnesota.
WALLACE M. NYE,
Mayor of the City of Minneapolis, Minn.
WINN POWERS,
Mayor of the City of St. Paul, Minn.

EXHIBIT NO. 1.

CHAPTER 141—S. F. NO. 406.

An act to authorize the formation of public corporations, under certain circumstances, in order to secure and provide electrical energy at approximate cost for cities and any State institution in any such city.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

SECTION 1. Any city situated upon a river where there may be secured a developed water power conveniently near for utilization in the creation and development of electrical energy to supply such city and any State institution therein with such energy at approximate cost, either alone or in conjunction with an adjacent city, may do so through a public corporation formed at its request as hereinafter provided.

One city may unite with another: Sec. 2. Any such city which may desire to avail itself of the provisions of this act shall proceed as follows:

If there is another city adjacent thereto, it shall be invited by resolution of the legislative branch of the city first mentioned to unite with the latter in securing the organization of such public corporation. If such adjacent city within 30 days thereafter shall by resolution accept such invitation, said city shall by further resolution of their respective legislative bodies declare their desire to so secure such water power and to have organized under this act a public corporation therefor, and shall by the same resolution request the respective mayors or other executive heads (by whatever name known) of said cities, and the president or other executive head of the governing or managing board of any State institution (or of the senior State institution, if more than one) in such cities to proceed to form such corporation under this act.

If there is no adjacent city, or if there is one and it fails or refuses to unite in the adoption of such resolutions within 30 days, the legislative body of the city which may desire to avail itself of the provisions of this act shall by resolution request its mayor or other executive head, its city engineer, or the head of its engineering department (if known by any other name), and the president or other executive head of the governing or managing board of any State institution (or of the senior institution, if more than one) within such city to proceed to form such a corporation under this act.

Officials to meet upon call of mayor: Sec. 3. The officials designated shall meet upon the call of the mayor (of the larger of the cities, if more than one) at his office, and shall proceed to organize themselves into a public corporation under some appropriate name for the objects and purposes stated in section 1, and shall unite in a certificate which shall state the name and objects of the corporation, the fact that it is organized under this act, and that the members of the corporation shall be themselves, during their respective terms of office, and their respective successors in such offices. Such certificate shall be recorded in the office of the secretary of state.

Corporation to elect officers and employ a manager: Sec. 4. Such corporation, when organized, shall provide for and elect such officers as it may designate, and may employ a manager and such other agents and servants as may be necessary for the corporate business, and may adopt such rules, regulations, and by-laws for the government of the corporation and of its employees as may seem best, but the members of such corporation shall receive no pay or compensation as such members, or as officers, but may have their actual expenses.

Authorized to acquire and develop water power: Sec. 5. Such public corporation, when organized, shall be authorized and empowered to acquire by lease or otherwise any developed water power within or near the corporate limits of the cities whose officers are ex officio members of such corporation; to acquire all necessary lands, rights and privileges, and to provide itself with a suitable hydroelectric plant fully equipped with auxiliary power plant necessary to utilize economically said water power, and with the necessary means of distribution of the electrical energy therefrom.

Disposition of electrical energy: Sec. 6. The electrical energy so developed shall be disposed of as follows: First, to the grantor from whom the water power is acquired, if the contract therefor so provides; second, to any State institution in such city or cities desiring the same; and, third, any surplus then remaining in equal shares to the cities whose officers are members of the corporation, if more than one; otherwise the whole to the single city.

Same rate to all patrons: Sec. 7. The same rate shall be charged by the corporation to all users of electrical energy so supplied, whether the user is the guarantor of the water power, a State institution, or a city, and that rate shall be sufficient to pay and cover the cost of operation, maintenance, interest charges, and the retirement of any indebtedness, and to provide for the renewal of the plant and for a reasonable emergency fund, and no more.

Issuance of bonds: Sec. 8. Such corporation shall likewise be authorized to raise money by the sale of its bonds or certificates of indebtedness to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation, and the indebtedness evidenced thereby shall be a lien upon all the property, rights, and franchises of the corporation.

Approved April 13, 1911.

EXHIBIT No. 2.

CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC CO.

The cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn., having by resolutions of their respective legislative bodies duly expressed and declared their desire and election in accordance with the provisions of chapter 141, Laws of 1911, to secure for said cities and the University of Minnesota, located in said city of Minneapolis, the benefits of any water power now developed or which may hereafter be developed within or near the corporate limits of said cities, and having by said resolutions expressed their desire and election to have a public corporation organized in accordance with the provisions of said chapter 141, Laws of 1911, for the purpose of acquiring any such water power and for the purpose of utilizing said water power in the creation and development of electrical energy to supply said cities and the said University of Minnesota with electrical energy at approximate cost:

Now, therefore, John Lind, the president of the board of regents of the University of the State of Minnesota; James C. Haynes, the mayor of the city of Minneapolis, Minn.; and Herbert P. Keller, the mayor of the city of St. Paul, Minn., in accordance with the request of the legislative bodies of said cities and pursuant to chapter 141 of the Laws of 1911, being "An act to authorize the formation of public corporations under certain circumstances in order to secure and provide electrical energy at approximate cost for cities and any State institution in any such city," approved April 13, 1911, and for the purpose of forming such corporation, do hereby certify as follows:

1. The name of the corporation shall be Municipal Electric Co., and its principal place of business shall be at the University of Minnesota.
2. The objects of this corporation and the general nature of its business shall be to acquire by lease or otherwise any developed water power within or near the corporate limits of Minneapolis or St. Paul, or either of them, and from said water power to develop electrical energy and to distribute the electrical energy so developed to any Federal institution and to any State institution within said cities, or either of them, and to the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and to that end and for that purpose to acquire all necessary lands, rights, and privileges, and to provide itself with the necessary electric plant or plants and with the necessary means of distribution of electrical energy, and to do all things necessary to carry out the purpose and object above expressed, and to that end to perform all and singular the powers and duties granted and described in and by chapter 141 of Laws of 1911.

3. The members of this corporation shall be John Lind, the president of the board of regents of the University of Minnesota; James C. Haynes, the mayor of the city of Minneapolis, Minn.; and Herbert P. Keller, the mayor of the city of St. Paul, Minn., during their respective terms of office as such president of the board of regents of the University of Minnesota, and such mayor of said cities, and their respective successors in such offices.

4. The corporation shall commence at the time of the execution of this certificate and shall continue thereafter perpetually.

5. The management of the business of this company shall be vested in the aforesaid corporate members, so long as they shall respectively hold the offices above named and in the persons who shall succeed them in said offices from time to time, it being the intent hereof that the chief executive officer of each of said cities and the executive head of the board of regents or other governing body of said university, shall be the governing body of this corporation.

6. Said corporate members shall annually elect one of their number as president of the corporation and may appoint a secretary thereof from their own members or otherwise, and such other officers, agents, and employees as it may be deemed necessary for the proper conduct of the business of this corporation and fix the compensation of such agents and employees, provided only that no members of this corporation shall receive any compensation for services rendered as members or officers of this corporation, and may adopt such by-laws, rules, and regulations for the government of the corporation and its officers, agents, and servants, as to said members shall seem best. The first president of this corporation shall be Herbert P. Keller, and the first secretary shall be James C. Haynes, who shall hold office until their respective successors are chosen and qualified.

In witness whereof, the parties have hereunto subscribed their names at the city of Minneapolis, Minn., this 24th day of November, 1911.

JOHN LIND,
President of the Board of Regents
of the University of Minnesota.
JAMES C. HAYNES,
Mayor of the City of Minneapolis, Minn.
HERBERT P. KELLER,
Mayor of the City of St. Paul, Minn.

In presence of—
FRANK J. WATEROUS,
WM. P. ROBERTS.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
County of Hennepin, ss:

On this 24th day of November, 1911, before me, a notary public, within and for said Hennepin County, Minn., personally appeared John Lind, president of the board of regents of the University of Minnesota; James C. Haynes, mayor of the city of Minneapolis, Minn.; and Herbert P. Keller, mayor of the city of St. Paul, Minn., to me personally known to be the persons described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and acknowledged that they executed the same as their free act and deed.

[SEAL.]

WM. P. ROBERTS, Notary Public,
Hennepin County, Minn.

My commission expires January 7, 1914.

Filed for record in this office on the 25th day of November, A. D. 1911, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

JULIUS A. SCHMAHL,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may proceed for 10 minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. It is pretty hard to make a statement covering this subject in less time than that. This means at least \$30,000 per year to the Government, and probably more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I wish again to call attention to the fact that at the time Gen. Bixby made that statement the charter of the Municipal Electric Co. was not on file in the War Department, and that is why he used the language he did. But he points out in his statement just what we have been contending for, to wit, that the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis and the State university are entitled to "reasonable concessions" in the way of a lease of this power and "should be given a preference" because they have practically donated a valuable water-power site and valuable flowage rights to the Federal Government. At the point where the high dam is erected and for several miles upstream the water flows through a deep gorge, leaving on either side quite a strip of lowland. This lowland has been a part of the park system of the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis. No one can tell what these lands are worth for park purposes. The two cities now have a population of nearly 700,000, and this park is right in the center of these two cities. It is safe to say that \$1,000,000 would not pay the actual worth of these park lands. No one can say at this time how much the power site is worth, because it is gradually increasing in value. Every power site in this country is increasing in value. There is no such thing as decrease in value of a water-power site.

For the purpose of improving navigation Congress authorized, in 1894, the construction of two locks and dams, known as Nos. 1 and 2, having a combined height of 27 feet, in the Mississippi River, between St. Paul and Minneapolis, at an estimated cost of \$1,166,437. The river between the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis flows through a gorge with a strip of lowland on either side of the channel. This lowland, as well as a valuable power site, was owned by the two cities and the State of Minnesota. For a nominal consideration the Government purchased a small tract of land on the left bank of the river for purposes of navigation, and the State of Minnesota and the city of Minneapolis, without any consideration except as herein stated, deeded to the Government the power site and the lowlands on the right bank of the river for purposes of navigation only. This deed was accompanied with the resolution—

that if any power should ever be developed in connection with one or both of the dams to be constructed by the Government in the Mississippi River between Minnehaha Creek and St. Anthony Falls, the city of Minneapolis ought to be entitled, and in good morals is entitled, to one-half of such power for public use by virtue of the donation of public lands by the city of Minneapolis for such dams and flowage rights in connection therewith, and the board further memorializes the Government not to grant or lease said one-half of such power to anyone except the city of Minneapolis.

The city of St. Paul passed similar resolutions.

By these respective deeds the Government acquired title to all of the lowlands; but, as a matter of fact, the water at the authorized level—the height of the dam—would cover only a small part of the lands acquired and the rest, which was heavily covered with timber, would still be left intact, and the people of the two cities would still derive the benefits of the natural beauties of the river gorge for park purposes as they had previously been doing, thus, while they had deeded to the Government these valuable park lands for the purpose of improving navigation, the public would still be able to use these lands to practically the same extent that they had theretofore.

In the early nineties water power became very valuable because of the discovery of long-distance transmission, which enabled the wide distribution of hydroelectric power, and an agitation was started looking toward the development of power at either or both of these dams.

In March, 1909, Congress authorized the appointment of a committee to investigate the feasibility of modifying this project so as to develop power as well as improve navigation. This committee was composed of Maj. C. S. Riche, Maj. Francis Shunk, and Maj. Charles S. Bromwell, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

The board thus created held a public hearing at St. Paul on January 12, 1910, for the purpose of securing a definite proposition from the Twin Cities and the State of Minnesota in reference to changing these dams from low to high.

The board made a complete report on this subject, which was published and is known as H. R. 741, Sixty-first Congress, second session. This report considers the proposition from three different points of view, only one of which for present purposes need be discussed, namely:

The erection of a single 30-foot dam (in lieu of the two dams) primarily for navigation purposes and incidentally for power purposes, such dam to be built in cooperation with the State and municipal governments.

Neither the United States nor any private corporation has the right to condemn lands for the purpose of developing power; however, the United States can condemn lands for the purpose of navigation; therefore, inasmuch as a single 30-foot dam, or high dam, would not be built as an aid to navigation, such lands as might be needed for the purpose of developing power could only be acquired by the consent of the municipalities and the State. That the board recognized this fact is evidenced by that portion of their report in which they state:

It is abundantly evident from the proceedings at this hearing that this land could not be acquired by a private company. Public opinion is so strongly against any such arrangement that the board is convinced that a recommendation in favor of cooperation with a private company would be equivalent to a recommendation that the high dam be not built.

If public opinion could be entirely disregarded—

Continued the report—

this proposition is entirely feasible, but such is the local feeling against private control that the board is of the opinion that such an agreement could not be brought about even if otherwise possible. The statements made to the board at its public hearing were most emphatic in this respect. The communities control the flowage rights and would prefer that the water run to waste rather than that any private concern should have any control of the power in any way, shape, or form. In view of this local sentiment, the board can not recommend that the United States should now endeavor to cooperate in this matter with any private concern, but that it should be carried out in cooperation with the State and municipal agencies, and that the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis have expressed a willingness to bear the increased cost of the scheme. Under such arrangement it seems evident that the cities should be the lawful owners of the power developed.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurred in this report as to municipal cooperation in the construction of the high dam. However, the Chief of Engineers, in submitting this report to Congress, recommended that the cost of construction of the high dam should be borne by the United States alone, "as experience had shown that any other policy might lead to friction and misunderstanding, often attended by serious complications." He further recommended—

that reasonable and proper concessions be made to the State and the Twin Cities in the matter of leasing the surplus power in exchange for flowage rights over their lands.

In the river and harbor act of 1910, Congress adopted the report of the special board, as modified by the Chief of Engineers, since which time the Government has abandoned Dam No. 2 and has been constructing Dam No. 1, as modified from 13 to 30 feet.

Through an act of the State legislature the State of Minnesota and the two cities have acquired a legal status under what is known as the Municipal Electric Co., and have been ready and willing at all times since Congress adopted the report of the Chief of Engineers to enter into a lease with the Government for the power at this dam. Up to the present time the Government has failed to recognize the desires, rights, and equities of the people of our State, assigning as its reason that there is not sufficient authority in existing law to make such a lease.

It is for the purpose of making definite and certain just what the Government is authorized to do that I offer this amendment.

The Government had acquired sufficient flowage rights from the State and the Twin Cities for the original project, but needed additional lands and flowage rights for the high dam. The city of Minneapolis has deeded the necessary additional lands to the Government on its side of the river, and the university stands ready and willing to do likewise.

The State of Minnesota and the two cities have donated to the Government this valuable power site and these valuable lands without any consideration, except a nominal amount paid to the State for a small tract of land near the east end of the dam, with the understanding that the State and the municipalities would be given reasonable and proper concessions in a lease of the power at this dam.

True, Congress has the sovereign right to dispose of this power in any way it sees fit, but notwithstanding it has the abstract legal right, it has no moral or equitable right. All the lands, with the one exception, given to the United States by the State of Minnesota and the municipalities were to be held in trust by the Government and returned later in the form of a privilege to lease any resultant power at a reasonable rate based on the cost of erecting that portion of the dam needed for power purposes, or, in other words, based on the difference between the cost of the completed modified project and the cost of the original plan. There is nothing legally to prevent the Government from disposing of this power as it sees fit; however, the paternal relation of the parties to this controversy and the equities involved sufficiently counteract any legal rights. In this case the Federal Government is dealing with a State and municipality, groups of its own citizens. The relation is a delicate one, and it is hardly conceivable that

the Federal Government would treat a State unjustly or take advantage of the trust placed in it by that State, a situation not reconcilable with the avowed policy of the Federal Government.

The United States, moreover, can not in good faith and conscience proceed with the disposition of this power without taking due cognizance of the equities of the two cities and the university which are involved, namely, (1) the surrender of valuable park lands; (2) the large additional cost entailed for changing sewer systems; and (3) the concession of valuable water-power rights upon the express understanding that any benefits accruing from the construction of the dam shall redound to the cities and the State which made the gift to the United States.

First. With the added height of the new project, a large area of beautiful wooded park lands will be totally destroyed. The Mississippi River gorge, with its natural park lands and attractive islands, has always been one of the beauty spots of the Twin Cities and a recreation ground for thousands of people. With the erection of the high dam all the islands will be flooded and the park lands at the foot of the bluffs will be under water. The trees have already been cut from the islands and from along the shore, leaving only a desolate expanse shorn of all its former beauties. This will be somewhat relieved by the creation of a pool or lake; but such a lake can be utilized only by a few, whereas the former park lands were used constantly by thousands. It is difficult to estimate the damage done and the damage still to result, as it is largely an aesthetic value rather than a pecuniary one, nevertheless, a real and substantial value not to be underestimated.

Second. The pool in the near future will also entail upon the two cities a large outlay for the construction of a trunk sewer system opening below the dam to care for all the sewers now opening into the river above the dam. As all Minneapolis sewers open directly into the pool, the burden will fall hardest upon that city. To leave the sewers in their present condition would mean the creation of a stagnant polluted pool giving rise to offensive effluvia detrimental to and endangering the lives of the near-by residents. The cost of the change in the sewer system has been estimated by the city engineer to be \$750,000 for the city of Minneapolis alone, and about \$500,000 for St. Paul. No exact figures are available at present.

That the power rights of the cities have considerable value has never been denied nor has it been accurately estimated, but the value has frequently been placed at a figure that is absurdly low. By comparing the flowage and other figures that can be and have been accurately ascertained with similar figures from plants now in operation under similar conditions a fair estimate of the actual value of the power rights can be determined.

The United States Government at present owns and operates a power plant at Rock Island, in the Mississippi River, a plant not much larger than that under construction at the Twin Cities. Col. Burr, the commanding officer, has prepared figures on the cost of electrical current and has also placed a valuation on the plant based on figures and results obtained from actual usage. The Rock Island plant is capable of developing 22,000 horsepower per year when fully utilized. At present only about 1,400 horsepower is being used by the arsenal at a cost of 3.6 mills per kilowatt-hour. For valuation purposes the average practical capacity of the plant is used as a basis, namely, 18,000 horsepower. At a cost of \$15 per horsepower per year the development of 18,000 horsepower is worth \$270,000 gross to the Government. Allowing \$50,000 for maintenance, interest, operation charges, and depreciation, the net profits to the Government would be \$220,000, which, upon the 3 per cent basis, would give a capital value of \$7,333,000 for the power project at Rock Island. Col. Burr in computing this value adds "that such an estimate is exceedingly reasonable," and that moreover, "it is a permanent indestructible property increasing annually in value and which will increase in value after all existing steam plants are consigned to the scrap heap." He further substantiates his point by referring to the project now pending to build a dam at the foot of the Le Claire Rapids, a short distance above the Rock Island Dam, a project which, in comparison to the water-power possibilities, would be a duplicate of the Rock Island Dam, and yet to develop this dam a private corporation proposes to spend \$10,000,000.

The power possibilities of the modified project at the Twin Cities have been estimated by various engineers at different times. Col. Potter, United States Engineer Corps, has estimated the average amount of power that can be developed to be about 9,500 horsepower per year. With electrical current worth \$20 per horsepower per year—a very conservative figure for Minneapolis, which is far removed from the coal fields—the gross

profits would be \$200,000. Allowing \$40,000 for maintenance, interest, and depreciation—a liberal allowance in comparison with Col. Burr's figures—the net profits would be \$150,000, which represents a net return of 3 per cent on a value of \$5,000,000. However, the high dam was built jointly for power and navigation purposes, whereas the Rock Island plant is solely for power, as navigation is cared for on the west branch of the river. Therefore, in computing the value of the dam at the Twin Cities a portion of the construction costs should be charged to navigation. This portion of the costs amount to a little over \$1,000,000, while the cost for power purposes plus the cost of the necessary power plant and machinery will not exceed \$1,000,000, leaving the value of the water-power rights over and above the cost of the dam, \$4,000,000.

These are the valuable water-power rights that the State and municipalities owned and which they gave to the United States practically free upon the express understanding that they were to be given reasonable concessions in the way of a lease of this power.

If this power is not leased to the cities, it must naturally be leased to a private corporation. The Municipal Electric Co. requested a lease based upon the cost of constructing that portion of the dam needed solely for power purposes. If a lease were made to a private corporation upon the same basis, the Government would virtually be making a gift to private interests of the \$4,000,000 of water-power rights and lands voluntarily given by the Twin Cities and the State to the Government with the understanding that the public and not private interests should receive any benefits accruing therefrom.

On the other hand, a lease of this power based on its actual value, about \$5,000,000, would place the Government in the anomalous position of having received without cost water-power rights worth \$4,000,000 from its citizens and turning them over to a private concern. The Government in such an instance would profit to the extent of the sum paid and the cities would suffer a loss of equal amount; besides, the corporation would follow the usual course of corporations and would issue stocks and bonds to at least the full value of these water-power rights and force the general public to pay the interest on this amount for all time to come. The Government would be placing an exorbitant and unjust burden upon its own citizens. It is beyond comprehension that the United States Government would be a party to such an unfair and unjust transaction. As it is impossible for a private concern to acquire control of the land and power rights without the consent of the cities, the Government would be acting as a tool or intermediary for a private corporation to the direct impairment of the public's rights if it should now grant a lease to a private concern.

Therefore, in view of the recommendation made by the Board of Engineers in H. R. 741, and in the adoption of this recommendation by Congress, together with the passage of a law authorizing the Government to make the lease with the municipalities; in view of the paternal relation existing between the General Government and the State and municipalities; in view of the loss to the cities of the valuable park lands for park purposes; in view of the cost entailed to the cities by the erection of the dam for the construction of a trunk-sewer system; in view of the surrender and grant of valuable power rights to the Government—in view of all these facts, the only policy that the Government can honestly pursue is to lease the power to the Municipal Electric Co. according to the original understanding and agreement. The position of the city is not antagonistic to private ownership or industry. All the city is asking is the right to use its own property in its own way.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is the gentleman speaking of some conditions that were imposed by the report under which this dam was constructed? Did those cities, or either of them, comply with those conditions?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. The city of Minneapolis has complied literally with those conditions. The State University is now ready—and has always been ready—to deed, and the city of St. Paul has some question about this, because there has been no effort on the part of the Government to do its part and enter into a lease with these cities and the university, as promised.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman will yield, I have at hand some modern information directly in point. The War Department says, speaking of the original act:

No stipulation has been made that either they or the city of St. Paul should acquire any part of the water power to be developed at Lock and Dam No. 1.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I decline to yield further.

Mr. ADAMSON. One more sentence, please.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Never mind. I will fix your sentence. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield. The gentleman from Georgia has never had any particular love for this proposition, and I am not surprised that he now tells this House that there was no stipulation made. What would a stipulation of that kind amount to? We are now asking that the Government make reasonable concessions to the cities in the way of a lease for this surplus power, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers and the Board of Engineers, and as recommended by this Congress in its adoption of the report of the engineers.

The Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers say the two cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis are deeply interested in the construction of a high lock and dam, and, in addition, say those two cities would be naturally the most desirable lessees of the surplus power that may be created thereby; through assurances of reasonable and proper concessions to them their flowage rights may be obtained by the Government without cost. That is what the Chief of Engineers recommended to Congress in his report known as No. 741, and that is the recommendation that the Congress adopted.

Of course I know, and the gentleman from Georgia knows, that there is some opposition to this proposition. I hold in my hand a letter written by Fred P. Royce, vice president of Stone & Webster, a member of the Hydroelectric Trust, and who was at the time he wrote the letter vice president of the Minneapolis General Electric Co., one of the subsidiary companies of the trust then under the control and management of the Stone & Webster people. I will place this letter in the Record. And I want to say to my friend from Georgia that that letter outlines the provisions of the bill that he has brought into this House this year, as well as the bill that he brought in last year. The only thing we demand is that the Government shall live up to the assurances that it held out to us at the time this project was adopted. We are only asking for justice and equity to those cities.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman's proposition contemplate that the public corporation mentioned should pay a sufficient amount of rental to cover the interest on the extra amount invested in order to make this high dam over and above what it would cost for navigation?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I am glad the gentleman interrupted me with that question. The amendment which I offer provides that the cities and the university shall pay the United States Government for the privilege of using the surplus water a fair and proportional cost of maintaining the dam, lands, and appurtenant works, and also pay, in addition, an annual sum not less than 3 per cent upon such amount as the United States shall have invested and expended in the completion of the project by which such water power is developed and maintained over and above the amount actually expended and which would have been expended in completion of the project for navigation only, and it also provides that every particle of this power shall be delivered to the Federal Government in case the Federal Government at any time should need it. [Applause.]

The letter of the vice president of the Minneapolis General Electric Co. to which I referred bears date, Boston, Mass., November 17, 1910, and was addressed to the Hon. Frederick C. Stevens, St. Paul, Minn., who was then a Member of Congress from the fourth congressional district of Minnesota, is in part as follows:

DEAR SIR: Following the writer's conference with you in Minneapolis in October we have thought that it might be of interest to you if we should prepare and submit to you a statement covering the history, condition, and purposes of the Minneapolis General Electric Co. and its policy toward the public at Minneapolis. * * * The principle that any company is entitled to earn a fair return on the money actually invested in the property necessary to carry on its business has become well established. It has also been demonstrated that a gas or electric company can not succeed in earning this fair return on its investment and at the same time furnish satisfactory service to the public unless it is allowed to have a field free from competition. * * * When it is understood that the demands on the company will be probably doubled oftener than once in 10 years, some idea of the probable future demands on the management of the company will be gained. Ample provision has been made to meet this future demand. Careful investigations having shown that there were certain good water-power developments possible within a comparatively short distance from Minneapolis, it was realized that the consumers should have the benefit of them. On that account the company has acquired most of the flowage rights necessary to develop at least five of these powers with an aggregate capacity of not less than 75,000 kilowatts.

The management of the Minneapolis company believe that they should be protected from competition. * * * We believe that in every case where a Federal license is requested and the power is to be used for public-service purposes a thorough examination should be made of the property by competent Government engineers, and no permit should

be granted unless it can be shown that there is a market for the power that can not be provided for as well and as cheaply by existing companies. * * * We should perhaps consider the best method to be adopted of utilizing the power that will be developed at the new Government dam at Minneapolis. * * * The logical and most satisfactory way of distributing this surplus power in Minneapolis would be through the Minneapolis company.

FREDERICK P. ROYCE,
Vice President Minneapolis General Electric Co.

The Frederick C. Stevens to whom the above letter was addressed is the same Frederick C. Stevens who, in company with Mr. ADAMSON, of Georgia, visited the War Department this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. I rise at the request of the chairman of the committee, Mr. Chairman; otherwise I would not have done so. I am sorry my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH] in a measure lost his temper. I had no idea on earth of offending him. I am not hostile to that project. I am very much in favor of that project, and I am very much in favor of the Government realizing something from it, especially as the Government has expended so much money creating it.

The letter I offered to contribute during the gentleman's speech is a modern letter, from the Secretary of War. It is not ancient history. In that letter he states what I knew, that no stipulation had been made with either of those cities that would require giving to them any water power to be developed at Lock and Dam No. 1. Further on in the letter—and I shall ask unanimous consent to print it in the Record—

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, if the writer of that letter means that no lease has been entered into with this corporation or with either of those two cities for the use of this water power, all right. But if he intends to represent that no representations were made to the cities, at the time the Government got the right to build this dam, that they would be given a preferential right in the leasing of this water power, then he states that which has no foundation.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, that is a quarrel between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Secretary of War. I am reading a letter from the Secretary of War:

Both cities have declined to convey the flowage rights now needed without consideration, and agreements have been reached whereby the city of Minneapolis will be paid \$15,000 and the city of St. Paul will be given part of the Government land at Lock and Dam No. 2, which is valued at \$6,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am very fond of both St. Paul and Minneapolis. They have treated me well on my visits there. I do not know of any two communities on earth less in need of charity than those two prosperous cities. There was no sign of a breadline or of any soup houses at all. I viewed the premises where the dam is. It is a magnificent structure that has cost a great deal of money. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH] is one of those who has declaimed in this House against giving away the rights of the Government and of the people. He is one of those who have impugned the

motives of statesmen here who have tried to procure general dam legislation for the benefit of all the people and the Government, on the ground that we were giving away something; and now his proposition is to come in and give either of the two cities and a corporation, after decrying about giving to other corporations, the benefit of what the Government has erected.

I have a further statement from the War Department showing all the structures similar to this in the United States. I wish to put that in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Following are the letter and statement referred to:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 11, 1916.

Hon. WILLIAM C. ADAMSON,
Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In further reply to your letter of January 30, 1916, requesting information for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in considering some of the details of water-power legislation, I have the honor to advise you as follows:

1. The total amount appropriated by Congress for the improvement of the Mississippi River between St. Paul and Minneapolis to date is \$2,391,600. The total amount expended to January 31, 1916, was \$1,544,583.44 for Lock and Dam No. 1 and \$739,044.14 for other work. The estimated cost of completion of Lock and Dam No. 1 is \$170,000.

2. The actual construction of Lock and Dam No. 2 began in the spring of 1898. This is a low dam built for navigation purposes only, has no effect on the water-power project, and will be drowned out by the high dam authorized in 1910 and now under construction. The appropriations and expenditures given in the preceding paragraph include work on this lock and dam.

3. The estimated time of completion of the contract: Some time during the navigation season of 1917.

4. As to the amounts paid for real estate, flowage rights, etc.—The total cost of land and flowage rights, including the cost of the sites of the two locks and dams, has been \$24,970 to date. The State of Minnesota and the city of Minneapolis have deeded land and flowage right without consideration, but no stipulation has been made that either they or the city of St. Paul should acquire any part of the water power to be developed at Lock and Dam No. 1. It should be stated, however, that the flowage right conveyed by the city of Minneapolis was under the original project and subject to a limitation as to the height of the dam. Under the present project the dam will be above that limit and the conveyance will be void on that account. Both cities have declined to convey the flowage rights now needed without consideration, and agreements have been reached whereby the city of Minneapolis will be paid \$15,000 and the city of St. Paul will be given part of the Government land at Lock and Dam No. 2, which is valued at about \$6,000.

Very respectfully,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 12, 1916.

Hon. WILLIAM C. ADAMSON,
Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In response to your request in paragraph 1 of your letter of January 28 last, I beg to inclose herewith a memorandum giving certain data with respect to the matter of the lease of power privileges at dams constructed in whole or in part with funds appropriated by Congress.

In response to paragraph 2 of the letter, I have the honor to inclose a table showing the maximum, minimum, and mean monthly discharge at Dam No. 1, Mississippi River, and the resultant theoretical and efficient horsepower that could have been developed during January and February of 1910–1915, inclusive. The computations of the horsepower which could have been developed are based on the assumption that dashboards 3 feet high would be in use during that time of the year.

Very respectfully,

H. L. SCOTT,
Acting Secretary of War,
Major General, Chief of Staff.

Table of horsepower at mean, maximum, and minimum discharge at Lock and Dam No. 1, Mississippi River.

	1910			1911			1912			1913			1914			1915		
	Average. ¹	Maximum.	Minimum.	Average.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Average.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Average.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Average.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Average.	Maximum.	Minimum.
JANUARY.																		
Disc. C. F. S.	4,200	5,600	3,240	1,764	1,955	1,610	1,840	2,400	1,550	2,600	2,950	2,250	3,615	4,470	2,100	3,837	4,270	2,900
H. P., Theor.	15,730	20,270	12,130	6,610	7,330	6,030	6,900	9,000	5,810	9,740	11,040	8,430	13,320	16,740	7,870	14,420	16,000	10,860
Eff. H. P.	11,800	15,710	9,100	4,960	5,500	4,520	5,170	6,750	4,360	7,300	8,280	6,320	10,140	12,550	5,910	10,810	12,000	8,150
FEBRUARY.																		
Disc. C. F. S.	4,011	5,200	3,240	1,799	1,945	1,610	1,750	2,265	1,520	2,200	2,605	1,950	3,170	4,100	1,825	3,721	4,370	2,960
H. P., Theor.	15,000	19,480	12,130	6,740	7,290	6,030	6,560	8,870	5,690	8,250	9,760	7,310	11,880	15,360	6,840	13,940	13,360	11,090
Eff. H. P.	11,250	14,600	9,100	5,050	5,470	4,520	4,920	6,660	4,270	6,190	7,320	5,480	8,910	11,520	5,130	10,450	12,270	8,320

¹ Average = mean monthly discharge, not average of maximum and minimum.

NOTE.—Effective head of 33' used in preparation of table above, and effective horsepower = 75 per cent of theoretic horsepower.

Memorandum of acts of Congress, and the projects constructed in accordance with them, establishing power privileges on dams owned or constructed in whole or in part by appropriations by Congress.

River.	Location	Part constructed.		Quantity of power.		Project document.	Acts of Congress.	Present status.	Affected by pending amendment to general dam act.
		By United States.	By other agency.	Developed.	To be developed.				
1. Fox.....	Neenah, Wis.....	Rebuilt by United States.	Built originally by private company.	2,433			July 7, 1870 June 10, 1872	Complete.....	No.
	Appleton, Wis.....	do.	do.	6,000			do.	do.	No.
	Little Chute, Wis.....	do.	do.	8,000			do.	do.	No.
	Kaukauna, Wis.....	do.	do.	781			do.	do.	No.
	do.	do.	do.	2,500			do.	do.	No.
	do.	do.	do.	725			do.	do.	No.
	do.	do.	do.	700			do.	do.	No.
2. Muskingum.....	Zanesville, Ohio.....			1,138			Aug. 5, 1886	do.	No.
	Duncan Falls, Ohio.....			540			Aug. 11, 1888	do.	No.
	Stockport, Ohio.....			985			do.	do.	No.
	Luke Chute, Ohio.....			1,045			do.	do.	No.
	Beverly, Ohio.....			564			do.	do.	No.
	Lowell, Ohio.....			1,220			do.	do.	No.
	Marietta, Ohio.....						do.	do.	No.
3. Green and Barren.	Kentucky.....						Aug. 11, 1888 Sept. 19, 1890		
4. Cumberland.....	Dam No. 1, Nashville, Tenn.....						June 13, 1902 amended June 28, 1902		
5. White.....	Dam No. 1, Arkansas.....	United States.					June 28, 1906		
6. St. Marys.....	Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., Edison Sault Electric Co.	Extension deducted from rentals.	Private company.				Mar. 3, 1909		No.
	Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., Michigan Northern Power Co.	do.	do.	10,000	30,000		do.		No.
7. Mississippi.....	St. Paul, Minn.....	United States.			15,000	H. Doc. 741 (61, 2).	June 25, 1910	77 per cent complete.	Yes.
8. Black Warrior.....	Dam 17, near Kellerman, Ala.	do.			10,000	H. Doc. 72 (62, 1).	Aug. 22, 1911	Lock and dam complete. No power developed.	Yes.
9. Coosa.....	Dam No. 4, Alabama.....	do.					June 4, 1906 Mar. 4, 1911		
10. Coosa.....	Dam No. 12, Alabama.....		Private company.				Mar. 4, 1907	Completed Mar. 4, 1914.	
11. Hudson.....	Troy, N. Y.....	United States.			4,000	H. Doc. 719 (61, 2).	June 25, 1910	Completed.....	Yes.

MEMORANDUM.

1. Dams on Fox River, Wis.: The Fox River improvement, with a series of locks and dams, was purchased from the Green Bay and Mississippi Canal Co. for the sum of \$145,000 appropriated by act of Congress approved June 10, 1872. Under the terms of the transaction the Government simply purchased the line of water communication, the water powers created by the dams being reserved to the company.

2. Dams on Muskingum River, Ohio: By a provision in the river and harbor act of August 5, 1886, Congress accepted from the State of Ohio the Muskingum River improvement, with all the locks, dams, canals, franchises, and property rights of every kind, including all water leases and rights to use water then running and in force between the State and private persons or corporations. In the river and harbor act of August 11, 1888, a provision was incorporated authorizing the Secretary of War to grant leases or licenses for the use of lands and water powers belonging to the United States for such periods of time and at such rates as he might deem just and expedient.

3. Dams on Green and Barren Rivers, Ky.: The Green and Barren Rivers improvement was purchased by the United States in pursuance of authority granted in the river and harbor act of August 11, 1888. The improvement consisted of a number of locks and dams built by a navigation company at which the surplus water was leased, and in the river and harbor act of September 19, 1890, Congress authorized the Secretary of War to continue the practice and to grant leases for periods not exceeding 20 years.

4. Cumberland River, Tenn.: By an act approved June 28, 1902, amendatory of the river and harbor act of June 13, 1902, Congress authorized the Secretary of War to lease the surplus water not required for navigation at Dam No. 1 on this river. No leases have so far been granted.

5. White River, Ark.: By an act approved June 28, 1906, Congress granted to the Batesville Power Co. the right to make construction for the development and use of water power at Lock and Dam No. 1, and for that purpose to withdraw water from the pool formed by said dam, the Secretary of War being authorized to fix from time to time the charges to be paid by said company for the use of said power.

6. St. Marys River, Mich.: In the river and harbor act of March 3, 1900, Congress provided that any excess of water in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie over and above the amount required for navigation shall be leased for power purposes by the Secretary of War upon such terms and conditions as in his judgment shall be best calculated to insure the development thereof. Under this authorization two leases have been granted—one to the Edison Sault Electric Co. and one to the Michigan Northern Power Co. These two leases cover practically all the surplus water belonging to the United States not needed for navigation at the rapids of St. Marys River, and each runs for a period of 30 years.

7. Mississippi River from St. Paul to Minneapolis: The river and harbor act of June 25, 1910, adopted a project for improvement which contemplated the construction of a high dam, and the leasing of water power created thereby, at rates that will insure a reasonable compensation to the United States. No leases have been made.

8. Dam 17, Black Warrior River, Ala.: By act approved August 22, 1911, Congress authorized the Secretary of War to change the plans for the construction of Dam No. 17 so as to increase its height to 63 feet, the object being: To render unnecessary the building of Locks 18 and 19, to provide for the extension of navigation up the Mulberry and Locust Forks of the river, and for the development of water power.

The lease of water power thus created has not been authorized by Congress.

9. Coosa River, Ala., Dam No. 4: By an act approved June 4, 1906, Congress authorized the Secretary of War to make a contract with any individual or corporation to complete the dam and forebay at Dam No. 4, and in consideration thereof the contracting party was to have the use of the surplus water for manufacturing purposes. No contract was made under this authorization, and in the river and harbor act of March 4, 1911, the Secretary of War was authorized to make a contract with the Ragland Water Power Co. to complete this dam, in consideration of which the company was to have the use of the surplus water for 50 years. A contract was entered into with the said company, but the work was not done, and the time limit for completion fixed by the act has expired.

10. Coosa River, Dam No. 12: By an act approved March 4, 1907, the Alabama Power Co. was authorized to build a dam at the site selected for Lock and Dam No. 12, and to use the water for power purposes, on condition that the Government should have the right to build a lock and control the dam for purposes of navigation. The dam was completed by the company within the time prescribed by the act.

11. Hudson River, near Troy, N. Y.: No provision for developing power has as yet been made nor is there any authority for disposing of it.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. When does your letter bear date?

Mr. ADAMSON. It is recent.

Mr. BORLAND. March 11, 1916.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes; March 11, 1916.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. That is after you knew this amendment was coming up?

Mr. ADAMSON. I knew some time ago about the gentleman's project. He gives me the credit of being opposed to it. I am opposed to this amendment, but I am not opposed to the project. I want to make this statement: I do not want to quarrel with the gentleman. I like him, and I wish him good in all things; but I want him to quit giving away what belongs to the Government and to the people. He has decied against that practice many times. There are many projects like this in the United States, not all of the same magnitude, but the paper which I will insert and print will show all of them. We have endeavored to agree upon a general plan by which the Secretary of War could lease the surplus water at any or all the Government structures. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD] introduced a bill for that purpose. We have not reported that separate bill, because the Secretary of War said he preferred to have it incorporated in the general dam legislation which you, Mr. Chairman, know, and the Secretary of the Interior

knows, and the Secretary of War knows, we are all trying to agree upon, so as to secure, not legislation dictated, as the gentleman wants, by any corporation or for the benefit, as he is trying to bring about, of any corporation, but a bill that will protect all the rights of the people and at the same time secure construction and advancement in the country.

The proposition approved by the Secretary of War is incorporated in the bill which has been reported here. If that bill can not be passed, the separate bill of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CLDFIELD] can be passed, which will enable the Secretary of War, under the general authority, to entertain propositions to dispose of the surplus water power at all these structures. But, Mr. Chairman, after all the lectures and insinuations that I have heard in this House for the last 20 years about giving things away, I am opposed to the Government spending two or three million dollars on a structure and then giving the power to any city or any corporation which pretends to operate as the trustee or intermediary between the Government and that city. If that is to be done, almost every city in the United States that is on a navigable river can call upon the Government as an eleemosynary institution to construct a dam and give it water power. Four or five cities in my own district could be accommodated by building dams, all at the aggregate cost that has been expended on this one project. If it is fair for them, it is fair for us; but the proper and fair thing to do is to allow a general provision, under which all can be treated alike. They ought all to be given a chance, so that the Government can on the most advantageous terms dispose of the surplus water power. In the meantime the act under which this project was authorized gives to the Secretary of War power to contract, if he can find an advantageous proposition. I do not care now to reply to the suggestions of gentleman about the general dam act, unjust and irrelevant as they are. At the proper time, when that bill is considered, I will take care of such unjust insinuations. Sufficient for this time to say that the corporation favored by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH] may be as bad as any other corporation. It certainly proposes a scheme to enjoy a monopoly. I worked on the general dam law before I ever heard of Stone and Webster, and neither that nor any other corporation can mistake the general dam legislation to me.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMSON. Certainly.

Mr. NORTON. Is the gentleman in favor of giving this great power, or the excess of this great power that the Government would not use, to the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, or does he rather prefer to give it to the General Electric Co. or some other private corporation?

Mr. ADAMSON. The Secretary of War ought to make the best contract he can to protect the interests of the Government, and at the same time to use it for navigable purposes as the prime object.

Mr. NORTON. Just another question. What objection has the gentleman to this Congress saying that the people of Minneapolis and St. Paul shall have this excess power to use, provided they pay to the Government a reasonable compensation or interest for the amount the Government has invested in the plant?

Mr. ADAMSON. I have no objection to their taking it if they bid more than anybody else and give better terms to the Government than anybody else; but I want the Government to make the best terms possible.

Mr. NORTON. That is all this amendment proposes, is it not?

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not understand this amendment to open it to the public at all.

Mr. NORTON. No; it gives it to the city.

Mr. ADAMSON. I prefer a general plan that will cover all these projects everywhere in the country. They ought all to be treated exactly alike, and the Secretary of War ought to be authorized, as he will be, to get the best terms possible in each case.

Mr. NORTON. Another question. The gentleman knows that this power is worth millions of dollars to the municipality or to the private concern that gets it. Now, does the gentleman think there ought to be any question but that that power, if it can be used by the citizens of Minneapolis and St. Paul, ought to go to them, and that Congress should say so?

Mr. ADAMSON. In the provision that we have incorporated it is provided that these cities shall have a fair opportunity, and the preferential opportunity to secure it solely for municipal purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I always value the opinion of my good friend from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] on any matter relating to transportation, and I really value his

opinion very highly on a matter of this kind; but I do not believe he quite appreciates the exact situation in the vicinity of this dam.

Mr. Chairman, I feel as though I were pretty well identified with this project. I have sort of grown up with it. When I was a senior at the University of Minnesota in 1894 this dam was begun. It is only now being completed. After the lapse of the 22 years that have passed I am glad to congratulate that locality that the dam is about to be completed. In its inception perhaps there was some question as to its value. In the 22 years that have passed those two cities have grown, and have become one of the greatest and most important industrial centers in America. The project originally did not comprehend water power. Now it does so, and properly. That water power is a Government instrumentality. It belongs to the people of the United States. For what purpose? For the Government to make money out of it? No; for the Government of the United States to administer for the welfare and best interests of the people concerned. [Applause.] Who are the people concerned? Not the people in the beautiful peach orchards of Georgia nor among the hills of Maine. They are upon the banks of the Mississippi River, where lie the great institutions that are affected. Now, what are some of those institutions? Fort Snelling is one of the great and important military posts of the United States. It is a large consumer of electric power. It is a post that will be enlarged, and that will need larger quantities of electric power as the years go by.

What is the next institution that we ought to consider? The University of Minnesota, which has made its contribution in order that this project might be completed. The shores of the campus are being inundated to a considerable extent in order that this dam may be built. That is no small, insignificant institution of learning. When I first went there the total membership was 1,500. To-day it is upward of 7,000. The campus then consisted of but a few acres. To-day it is large, and for a long distance skirts the Mississippi River. That great institution, with its colleges devoted to mechanical arts, with its mining and engineering colleges, even running an electric railway to connect the main campus with the school of agriculture, requires large quantities of electric power.

It has made its contribution; it is a public institution, performing a tremendously important public work; why not let it get some of the benefits resulting from the development of the water power on its own land? What public purpose higher than this can there be to serve? The education of the youth of a land to lead in the industrial development of a region and in the humanitarian work among a great people is of the very highest public concern. To improve the facilities afforded by such an institution should be the object of all having the public interests in charge. The Federal Government, too, is directly interested in many features of the university. For instance, at this institution of learning is one of the finest cadet battalions in the country, 1,400 in number, and that is an institution existing for Federal purposes only.

I would have failed, indeed, had I omitted to mention the biggest consideration of all, the hundreds of thousands of people in St. Paul and Minneapolis who in their corporate municipal capacity are deeply interested in this project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I know what it is in some degree to find a water power corralled within the hands of a few, and so does every man here. There are some water powers, even along the Mississippi River, yet available, but not many. This is one of the best of all, and, thank God, it is the property of the United States, to be administered for the welfare of the people. Now, let us administer it for the welfare of the people of that great center. [Applause.] Let us provide, as the amendment does, that the people who have builded their homes here, the people who have lived there, the people who have formed the two cities, the people who have deeded the land necessary for the construction of the enterprise, the people on whose land this water power is being developed, shall be allowed to conserve this power for the public good and have the first chance to use this water power, not only using it for strictly municipal purposes but regulate its use by its citizens without paying tribute to corporations that will doubtless seek to control it. If you do that, you have administered a public utility for the welfare of the public; and if you fail, in my judgment you have set yourselves against the general interests of public welfare. [Applause.]

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the provision for the construction of this dam was adopted in the river and harbor act of 1910, based on a report of the engineers known as House Document 741, Sixty-first Congress, second session.

In that report of the Chief Engineer's the summarization of the matter is in this language:

That from the standpoint of navigation and other Federal interests, it would be advisable to modify the existing project in such manner as, while better serving those interests, will permit the creation and utilization of a valuable water power which can be applied to minimizing the cost of construction; (b) that instead of inviting the cooperation of and entering into contractual relations with any private or municipal corporations for the execution of the work (a policy which experience has shown to be conducive to friction and misunderstanding, and often attended by serious complications), the cost of construction should be borne by the United States alone so that the control of the water power will be absolute, and it may be used, leased, or otherwise utilized as may be most advantageous to interests of the Government.

Mr. MADDEN. How much water power is it to develop?

Mr. SMALL. Fifteen thousand horsepower.

Mr. MADDEN. What do they do with it?

Mr. SMALL. They do not utilize it at present, for it is not completed. The last report of the engineers shows that on the 30th of June last the project was 87 per cent completed. Doubtless work has been continued since that time and it is now more nearly complete.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. The gentleman is reading from page 4. Will he read all of page 4? I want to say to my colleague that it is immaterial how much more the dam has cost than the \$200,000 estimated by the board, because my amendment provides that there shall be paid at least 3 per cent on every dollar put into the dam over and above the original estimate.

If the gentleman will read a little further on the page, leaving out the estimate, he will find what concession the Chief of Engineers desired to make to the cities, but take the whole report and he will find that the board that visited the two cities made the report to the Chief of Engineers recommending that the two cities should have the power without qualification, except to furnish the needed money, and that was why the Chief of Engineers changed the language, because he thought it was better that the United States should furnish all the money and that there should be no partnership about it.

Mr. SMALL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think everyone will concede that the two cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis should be permitted to utilize this power at the proper time and on the proper terms, providing they are willing to give the Government as much as any other person or corporation which may desire to use the same power.

But the crux of the matter lies in the contention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON]. The proposition here is to lease the power to the hydroelectric corporation if it pays the expense of the maintenance of the dam itself, not of the navigable river, and 3 per cent on the cost of the construction of the dam.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SMALL. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Now, regardless of whether that is a fair or not fair price, there are two vital objections to it. One is that we have been holding up utilization of water powers all over the country until we could get a general dam act. That act we expect to have passed at this session. The Senate has already passed an act.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. This dam was started long before your general dam act. My distinguished colleague from Georgia has just told you that the idea running through the general dam act now before Congress is to put the power up to public auction and sell it to the highest bidder. If you do that the municipalities can not get it. This is the only way we can get it. We have appropriated the land, notwithstanding what my colleague says. The War Department has a deed from Minneapolis of every foot of the land that is necessary for the project, with a condition attached to it that if the Government does not do it it will give \$15,000 for a little small stretch of it.

Mr. SMALL. In other words, the gentleman wishes for this corporation to be the recipient of unadulterated favoritism.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Oh, no.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes so that I can make a correction.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FERRIS). This is not closing debate. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, this subject was not mentioned at the War Department this morning, and in the second place, as I remember, and I have sent for a copy of the bill to see for certain, the provision in the general dam act as reported by me, I think, gives the cities the preference for municipal purposes solely, but not for the purpose of allowing a corporation under that pretext to take charge of the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ADAMSON. Oh, I do not mean to say that you are operating under that pretext at all.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that this is my time.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes; but I will ask the gentleman to make it brief.

Mr. SWITZER. Does the gentleman believe this ought to be put in a way that some corporation, some monopoly could run the price up and obtain control of the power and force the city to pay a higher price?

Mr. SMALL. No; I do not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question in that connection. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to ask this question, and it seems to me that it goes to the whole of the great problem now before Congress and the American people, and that is the question of hydroelectric power—if these are to be put up to the highest bidder, will not the General Electric Co., with millions of capital behind it, get all of the valuable property? It can bid more than any other bidder.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, under the general dam act, as it shall finally be passed, the interest of the United States will be properly conserved and the interest of the consumers will be properly conserved; but I have not the time to go into that matter now. The point that I make is that this power development by this dam in the upper Mississippi, between St. Paul and Minneapolis, should be put upon the same basis, with no better and no worse terms than other water powers which have been and which will be developed in the future by the Government of the United States.

Mr. STEENERSON rose.

Mr. SMALL. I can not yield further. I want to make this further suggestion. The United States has spent in the construction of reservoirs above at the headwaters of the Mississippi \$1,559,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the city of Minneapolis, through its great manufacturing plants, its flour mills, is one of the beneficiaries of the conservation of these headwaters of the Mississippi in these reservoirs, and by reason of the equalization of the water they are getting the benefit of it during a longer season of the year. They are now coming in and asking, not that the city of Minneapolis or the city of St. Paul, not that this particular corporation, shall get this water power upon such terms as others are willing to pay, and terms, if you please, which will at the same time protect the users of it, but they ask you to adopt an amendment fixing the name of the lessee of this water power, fixing the terms regardless of the opportunity to consider and determine whether these are fair terms, and regardless of whether they shall coincide with the terms that shall ultimately be adopted by Congress in the general dam act. It is unfair and is a species of favoritism.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] have outlined what we have a right to assume is their view of the future policy of the United States with regard to surplus power to be developed by Government dams, and I do not believe that this House will at this time, at the very beginning of the development of this policy, place it upon the basis that they have indicated; that is to say, where the

Government has surplus power to dispose of, that it shall put it up at public auction and sell to the highest bidder. The vice of that policy is plainly seen in the case before us. Here is a project developing 15,000 horsepower per annum, worth perhaps \$150,000 or \$200,000 each year, and when it is proposed to lease it to the corporation representing the municipalities, especially organized to serve the public without profit, upon the basis of a rental that will bring at least 3 per cent interest on the investment to the Government, you say no, that is not enough; we will put the lease up at auction and sell it to the highest bidder. The proposition in the amendment is to pay the Government a suitable income upon the investment over and above what the Government has spent for navigation.

If this be put up at public auction to the highest bidder, the Stone & Webster Co. or affiliated companies will bid up the price in order to obtain—what? To obtain a power which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] has with such great ability been fighting these many years, namely, monopoly. It will be possible under this plan for the present power concerns to bid in the Government power, to get it from the Government, and then control it and have a monopoly of power in that great center of population indefinitely. Then, when they have obtained that, they will exploit the people upon the basis of the improvement built by the Government without restraint. Is that what we are adopting this water-power policy for? Is that the purpose you seek to accomplish? Or is it that we may get income upon the money invested and serve the public at cost, like every municipal or public-service institution? [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. Assuming that the private corporation would overbid the city and get the power from the Government, would it not then turn around and sell the power to the same set of consumers at an advanced price represented by the increased bid?

Mr. STEENERSON. Why, certainly. It would bleed the people of Minnesota. It would bleed the people of Minneapolis and St. Paul and the University of Minnesota to the last farthing, and you, the Congress of the United States, would put power in their hands to do that forever. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much times does the gentleman want?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want five minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may want five minutes. If the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] is going to conclude, I do not care to use any time; but if other gentlemen are going to attack the proposition, I shall want some time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will yield to the gentleman from Washington, then.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting with a great deal of interest to have some of my conservation friends on this side of the House arise and insist that the same rule be applied in this case that they have always insisted should be applied to the water-power projects in the West. What has become of the gentlemen on this side of the aisle that have been so insistent that the Government, in selling this water power, ought to make the charge upon the amount of power developed? I have not heard anybody make that statement here to day.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield for a moment? Will you make any distinction between a city that owns a water power, that owns valuable private land, that has to spend in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000, and the water site out on the Government domain and the Government owning all the land and all the site?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, ever since I have been a Member of this House, since the question arose in regard to the development of water power, I have heard it insistently urged on the floor of this House that the Government should charge for the power developed and not for the value of the property. And here in this particular instance you propose to let them have this power and charge them 3 per cent over and above what it would have cost the Government to construct it for navigation purposes. Now, I do not consider that that is a fair compensation for the Government if you are going to compensate it at all—3 per cent on the money, beginning at the time when the contract is entered into. I hope that before this discussion ends some of my conservation friends that have stood upon the floor of this House so often and have blocked every attempt that has been made to develop water power in the West will explain themselves as to why it is different when in the Middle West, when it is in Min-

nesota. What has become of our distinguished patriot on this side of the House that has so often stood up here and said that the Government must not be robbed? If you are going to develop water power, let us have it upon the power developed and not upon the value of the land or the money put into the proposition, or abandon this rule for the West. Why do they want one rule for the Middle West and another for the Pacific coast? I hope that the patriotic conservationists have not taken to the cloakroom because this matter is up for consideration. Why do not the conservationists seek to protect the Government now as they always pretend to do when there is a project on the Pacific coast to be considered?

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to read a sentence that the gentleman on the other side would not permit me the time to read a short time ago. It is as follows:

Provided, That the said Secretary of War in making such leases, other conditions being equal, shall give preference to the bid solely for municipal use of any municipal corporation or other public corporation not operated for profit.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Of course that is fair; there can be no question about it. But here we are certainly asked to give an advantage to this one particular corporation. Why should they not comply with the general law? Of course I am not in sympathy with a great deal we hear in regard to these water powers, but, as I said a moment ago, I can not help but notice it when they talk one thing for the Pacific coast and another for the Middle West.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Chairman, I believe in conservation, but I do not advocate what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] suggests of Minnesota Members. The position I take upon that question is, that whenever the Government turns over to a private monopoly any of these water powers they place within the power of that monopoly the right, or rather the privilege, to charge back to the people whatever the private monopoly sees fit unless there is some Government regulation of prices.

The trouble with the proposition is that if a private corporation, in business solely for the profits it can make out of the business, gets possession of this water power, then it will charge back to the people in general, not only what it pays to the Government, but such additional sum as it sees fit to make for its own profits. Now, if we lease this water to a municipality or the university, every advantage is with the public. That is a very difficult thing than giving a monopoly to some private concern.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Sure I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Inasmuch as the gentleman recognizes the right of the Government to go and pay it 3 per cent on the investment, why do you not place that compensation on the water developed, the same as you are insisting on being done with the water powers of the West?

Mr. LINDBERGH. The gentleman is mistaken in saying that I claim any such thing. My position is this, that whatever the Government charges will be charged back to the consumer whether in one part of the United States or in another part of the United States. I am opposed to the Government granting any privilege to a private monopoly at any price, for what sense is there in the public granting such a right for a consideration which the courts hold that the monopoly can turn right about and charge back to the public plus such profit as it sees fit, or at least a profit over and above what it pays to the Government for, say, in this case, a lease. The Government making a bargain for the purpose of getting more money into the Treasury simply means that whatever bargain they make must be returned in some form to be collected back from the people in general. And we have to draw a distinction between a municipality or university that is going to use this power and a private corporation securing the control of the power to levy a profit on the people.

We have to draw a distinction between this case of the municipality of Minneapolis, or the university, or public utility it is for, or that is going to use this power, and a private corporation seeking to control that power simply to make money out of it. That is all the explanation I wish to make in connection with the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted; not that I have any objection to the two cities—St. Paul and Minneapolis—obtaining cheap hydroelectric power, but I object to giving them a preference in the use of such power over others, private or public, in this country.

It is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that for some time we have been unable to pass legislation here by the Government with authority to any private or quasi public institution to use such power. Every time a proposition of that kind has come up before this House it has been voted down. I recall very distinctly a bill brought in here by the Rivers and Harbors Committee about four years ago to build a very high dam, No. 17, on the Black Warrior River, within 12 miles of the city of Birmingham, Ala. This dam would furnish a sufficient head to develop a large amount of power, and the proposition was coupled with authority to a certain corporation to use the power under lease from the Government. But it was voted down, not unanimously, to be sure, but overwhelmingly, and from then until now no committee of the House, certainly not the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, has thought it advisable to bring in a similar measure, although there are many places where power can be developed, our purpose being to await the effort being made by another committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] is chairman, to present to this House a bill that will take care of these propositions wherever they may arise throughout the country.

I think it is unwise, Mr. Chairman, to single out these particular cities and practically give them this power which is owned by all the people of the country, whether in or outside of our cities.

Now, suppose some one were to come and say, "This high dam on the Black Warrior River is constructed in such a way as to be in a position to develop a great deal of power. Let us turn that over to the city of Birmingham on certain conditions very favorable to that city, or some corporation that will obligate itself to turn over part of it to the city of Birmingham." There would be just the same objection to that as there is to the proposition here.

Now, as I said a moment ago, I have no objection to these two cities obtaining cheap power, but I can not go quite as far as my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] did a while ago, when he asserted with emphasis that this power was the people's power. Now what was his deduction from that premise? Not that the whole people should have the benefit of it, but those two cities. It belongs to all the people, but according to his view those two cities should have the use of it. That is not the proper deduction to make from the premise.

If the Adamson bill passes—and it has got to pass some time or other—it will be for this House to say just what it will contain. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] has read a proviso, already in the proposed bill, which, if the measure becomes a law, will take care of this whole situation. It gives preference not only to the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul but to every other city in the country to utilize the power that the Government may develop.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for just a moment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I am sure that the gentleman does not understand the effect of the bill prepared by the gentleman from Georgia. The effect of his bill, as he claims, is that municipalities shall have a preference. How? After the power has been put up at auction and sold to the highest bidder. If you can show me how any municipality in this country will get any benefit out of a bill that authorizes the Secretary of War to put up at public auction and sell the power to the highest bidder, then I will withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It says:

Provided, That the Secretary of War, in making such leases, other things being equal, shall give preference to the bid, solely for municipal use, of any municipal corporation or other corporations not operated for profit.

I am not sure but what that would cut out the gentleman's corporation, and that it would cut out the two cities solely for their use.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. You have not read the provision in the bill prepared by the gentleman from Georgia. I will read it. It says:

Provided, That the Secretary of War, in making such leases, other things being equal, shall give preference to the bid, solely for municipal use, of any municipal corporation or other public corporation not operated for profit.

That is, it shall give preference to the highest bidder, other things being equal.

There are two things in that bill that destroy what he would like to have us believe that he desires to accomplish. If he gets his bill through, it will give preference to a municipality, but it requires that the Secretary of War shall put this power up at auction and sell it to the highest bidder.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We have not enacted that bill into law. When it comes before the House we can do what we please with it. I have every confidence that the House will do that which is right.

Now, another feature that would cause me to oppose this amendment, if there were nothing else, is that we own this power now. The Government of the United States has it, can control it, and do what it pleases with it. But the moment this amendment is adopted, if the Government wants to use any power there it will have to go to this corporation and pay for it. I do not want any such condition as that.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. The gentleman does not quite understand the amendment. Under the amendment the United States Government will have the first right to all of this power at just exactly what it costs to manufacture it, with no profit to anyone.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not say that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am opposed to turning over this power to anybody under such conditions. The provision is:

The right shall be reserved to the United States and included in such contract for the United States to purchase and use such supply of said power as may be required for its own purposes on the same terms and conditions as the said power is sold or distributed to the members of said public corporation of the State of Minnesota.

I am opposed to putting the Government of the United States in any such position. We have the power now, and we had better keep it as it is for the present and until proper legislation for its disposition can be enacted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MADDEN. Just five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in seven minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would like three or four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to modify his request?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understood from the gentleman that if I wanted to close the debate I could do so.

Mr. ANDERSON. I said if the gentleman desired to close the debate I did not desire any time, but the gentleman is not going to close.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We ought to get on with this bill. I think everybody understands it.

Mr. MADDEN. I am ready to take a vote now. I will yield, and let the vote be taken.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Minnesota) there were—ayes 47, noes 58.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 46, noes 65.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend my remarks by introducing a letter from Mr. Frederick C. Stevens, and also the law and charter and application relating to this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LENROOT: Page 29, line 7, strike out "\$1,500,000," and insert "\$150,000."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect that this amendment will be adopted, because in the consideration of this bill it is very plain that the United States Treasury is entirely

forgotten, and that economy has no place in the consideration of a measure of this character. Earlier to-day in the debate I suggested what I believe to be a proper river and harbor bill under the present condition of the Treasury, and that is a bill carrying appropriations that would maintain rivers and harbors to accommodate the commerce that now exists upon them, and in addition appropriations for the carrying on of existing projects where there would be a direct and substantial loss to the Government if the projects were not carried on at this time. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the committee, in reply to that suggestion stated that with very few exceptions that was the theory of this bill. I do not know whether my good friend from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] will admit that this item is one of those exceptions or not; but the truth nevertheless is that it is one of the exceptions. If this amendment of mine should be adopted, which I know it will not be, there would be a direct saving to the United States Treasury at this time of \$1,350,000, and at the same time the Missouri River will be maintained in its present condition; and all of the public works that are going on under existing projects will be maintained so far as necessary so that there will not be a dollar of loss to the Government; so if this Missouri River \$20,000,000 project is a meritorious project, the only thing that will be accomplished by the adoption of this amendment will be to postpone that expenditure of \$1,350,000 until such time as the Treasury is in better condition.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SWITZER. Does the gentleman expect the appropriation in the next four or five years will be any smaller than it will be this year?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not; but I do expect that the Treasury will be in better condition than it is to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] And if the Treasury is not in better condition, then I am frank to say that the appropriations ought to be very much smaller than they are in this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, this Missouri River project is one that was specially examined with a view to reporting to Congress upon the question whether that project should be abandoned or not. It was first referred to the district engineer, Mr. Deakyne, who made a report upon it under date of April 22, 1915. He recommended that the project be entirely abandoned and that hereafter an appropriation of only \$40,000 a year be made for the purpose of snagging; and, reading from his report, speaking of the commerce upon this river, he says:

Eliminating the logs and the sand and gravel barged, the remaining traffic is 37,551 tons, divided into classes which are carried over average distances of from 8 to 291 miles. The total freight charge on this traffic was about \$41,000. The Kansas City-Missouri River Navigation Co., the only through line on the river, operating between Kansas City and St. Louis, charges 80 per cent of the railroad freight rates. Assuming this to be the relation between the rail and water rates for the entire traffic, the saving to shippers by the use of the river in 1913 was about \$10,000.

Let me say right here that, irrespective of the completion of the continuation of the present project, it has cost the Government \$100,000 annually for maintenance, or, in other words, it cost the Government \$90,000 over what was saved in freight rates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. The cost to the Government for maintenance alone, to say nothing about the cost of the project, was \$10 for every dollar that was saved in freight rates.

Now, it is fair to say that it is reported that this last year the commerce was \$60,000 as against \$37,000 in 1913. The average cost per ton by rail is \$1.40 in round numbers. The cost by water is about \$1.10, and so there is a saving by water carriage of 30 cents a ton.

Now, assuming that it was 60,000 tons, there is a saving to the shipper of \$18,000, at a cost to the Government of \$100,000, to say nothing about the cost of the project itself. It is true that when the project was first begun it was estimated that there would be a million tons of traffic upon this river. I undertake to say that no man in this House will ever see the time when there is a million tons of traffic on the Missouri River between Kansas City and St. Louis. But assuming there is a million tons, assuming there is a saving of 30 cents a ton, it is estimated that the annual cost of maintenance will be \$500,000 a year, so that the Government, even if there is a million tons of traffic

carried on this river, will be paying out of the Treasury a half a million dollars a year to save the shippers \$300,000 a year.

Referring to the Deakyne report, he says:

It is evident that this saving is entirely inadequate to warrant the serious consideration of an expenditure by the Government of \$1,100,000 per year in interest and maintenance.

The report of Mr. Deakyne went next to the division engineer for review—Col. Townsend—and Col. Townsend, by the way, is one of the three engineers who recommended, in the first instance, the adoption of the \$20,000,000 project.

Col. Townsend, in reviewing the report of the district engineer, agrees with it in every particular save one, that instead of \$40,000 a year for snagging he recommends \$150,000 for maintenance, and that is the amendment that I have proposed. He says in his report that if this \$150,000 is properly expended it will not only keep the river clear but will maintain, without any loss to the Government, the work that has been done by the Government.

In paragraph 4 of Col. Townsend's report, he says:

In the opinion of the division engineer, the problem of developing our western rivers should be treated as a single one. Instead of scattering appropriations over the entire western territory, a channel of 8 or 9 feet depth should first be provided from Chicago to New Orleans, and the offer of assistance in the construction of a canal along the Des Plaines River from the State of Illinois accepted. An opportunity should then be afforded the American people to determine whether they want waterways not by rhetorical efforts in river conventions but by a practical utilization of the channel thus afforded. Until such revival occurs appropriations on the tributaries should be confined to maintaining the existing status. The existing works should not be allowed to deteriorate. At present an annual appropriation of \$150,000 for snagging and the maintenance of existing works is therefore recommended.

Turning again for a moment to the Deakyne report, he refers to the prospective commerce on the Missouri River, and calls attention to the fact that on the Mississippi River, where there is a stretch of river exactly similar to that proposed upon the Missouri, except only that the facilities for traffic and country tributary is very much greater than on the Missouri, but after that has been completed the highest traffic has been 258,000 tons per year upon that portion of the Mississippi River, and he says that it is unreasonable to suppose that the traffic on the Missouri River will assume any larger proportions than that.

So you have Deakyne's report recommending the abandonment of the \$20,000,000 project, and we have Col. Townsend's report, who was one of the three who originally recommended the project, recommending the abandonment of the \$20,000,000 project, and finally it comes to the Board of Engineers for review, and that board met at Kansas City.

I am not going to criticize the Board of Engineers any more than to say that the Board of Army Engineers is human just as Members of Congress are human, and they are subject to political influences, I believe, to a lesser degree than most people, and, nevertheless, they are subject to political influence to some extent, which is not necessarily reflecting upon them. Any man who will take that report of the Board of Engineers wherein they recommend the project be not abandoned and will read it carefully from beginning to end will conclude that they have not made a showing that would satisfy any jury in the United States that that project should be continued. They have some 20 paragraphs in this report, and if you will examine the report thoroughly you will see that there are only two or three findings of fact in the entire report, but paragraph after paragraph that states not what they believe but what the Kansas City interests claim. Again and again you will find in each paragraph, "It is claimed by interested parties," "It is stated by interested parties," and so on, and when they come to the final paragraph wherein they sum up their reasons for their action in not concurring in the report of the district and division engineers, they say:

A review of the entire situation indicates that the present grounds for continuance of this project were stronger than those which led to its adoption. The board therefore concludes that it is advisable for the United States to continue the improvement—

And so forth.

They say the reasons are stronger now than when the project was adopted, and that is based upon the fact that when this was adopted there was no commerce, and that now there is a commerce of 60,000 tons upon that river, costing the Government, irrespective of the \$20,000,000 we propose to expend, \$6 for every dollar that is saved to the shippers upon this record.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone into the merits of this for the purpose solely not at this time of recommending the abandonment of the project, but of showing to this committee that if they wish to vote upon this question upon its merits, if they wish to save \$1,350,000 to the United States Treasury, leaving the consideration of the ultimate improvement, acceptance, or

abandonment of this project to such time as the Treasury is in condition to consider it, they will adopt this amendment that I have proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman has stated that he has no serious idea that the House will adopt his amendment. If he is anywhere as near correct in his statement, his amendment itself, expending \$150,000, would not be justified. How can he justify expending \$150,000 a year if the commerce is measured by the statement which he made of \$10,000 saving in freight rates? In no case ought his amendment to be adopted. But the gentleman has overlooked what I have attempted to call to the attention of the House, namely, the difference of putting a waterway, a navigable river, in condition as a carrier of freight and the improvement of a harbor upon the coast. An improved harbor becomes at once the terminal facility for lines of railroads, and is of great advantage to railroads as well as to all other forms of transportation. It ought to be built because it is an outlet for American commerce. A river differs from a harbor in that it is a competitor of the railroad in the interior of the country. This is what makes the difference in the fight on river improvement.

The Missouri River, from Kansas City to the mouth, is a direct competitor of five lines of railroad. Not only that, but it is a direct rate regulator for all of the lines of railroad running west of the Missouri River—between that and the Rocky Mountains. All of the traffic originating west of the Missouri and between that and the Rocky Mountains, and in some cases to the Sierra Nevada, wants an outlet to the east. It must have through routes, with joint rates and joint tariffs made over and upon the same lines of shipment. The minute you introduce a new line of shipment, a new competitor that is willing to take 80 per cent of the rail rate, as the boat line is willing to do, you have a fight on your hands. We have had a fight on our hands to build up a traffic on that east and west line of the Missouri River between Kansas City and St. Louis competitive with the railroads. I need not depend on anybody for testimony to that effect other than the railroad men themselves. In case No. 6119 of the Interstate Commerce Commission, being the case against the Illinois Central and Mississippi & Yazoo Valley Railroads, Mr. Shepherd, assistant freight agent of the Illinois Central, testified:

The rates between New Orleans and Kansas City are not normal rates, but are depressed by water competition on the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers.

Therefore the amount that is hauled by boats on the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers is not the full measure of the saving to the shippers in that territory, and that was the underlying and fundamental mistake of Mr. Deakne. Mr. Deakne came from Philadelphia to Kansas City. On the 4th day of March we passed a bill providing that certain projects should be reexamined, and on the 22d of April Mr. Deakne had sent in his report condemning the project he had been sent there to look at. The committee of river engineers went over the situation as no river has ever been gone over to my knowledge in the history of the country, and this report embodies their findings; and the report says in its conclusion—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment that I would like to offer, and I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto end in 17 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. I quote from the report of the Board of River Engineers:

The United States embraces within its limits widely varying conditions of soil and climate, with farm, mine, and forest products of all kinds. Each section has some special advantage in the production of at least one of the articles required in civilized life. To attain the maximum benefit from these conditions it is essential that the means of intercommunication and distribution shall be fully developed, so that producers and consumers may be served at a minimum of cost. Both railways and waterways are needed. Each class of transportation has a sphere of its own. Destructive competition between them is uneconomical and wrong. In the more thickly settled parts of the

country both now flourish even on parallel lines. It is uncertain whether this condition is as yet possible in the Missouri Valley. Its inhabitants claim that it is. This waterway lies in a direct path of traffic, and a well organized freight carrying line operates on it. When equally efficacious and up-to-date water transportation lines shall have been established on the Mississippi River, it seems beyond reasonable doubt that the commercial possibilities of these streams will be utilized to advantage. The testimony given to the board and appearing in the record of the public hearing shows potent causes for the decline of river traffic entirely apart from the true relative costs of transportation by rail and water. Changes of law have eliminated some of these causes, and it is claimed that the operations of the Kansas City-Missouri River Transportation Co. give promise that the remainder will disappear, and that through such agencies the much-to-be-desired problem of minimum cost of transportation by water and rail will receive a definite solution.

A review of the entire situation indicates that the present grounds for continuance of this project are stronger than those which led to its adoption. The board therefore concludes that it is advisable for the United States to continue the improvement of the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth in accordance with the existing project.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How many engineers were on that board?

Mr. BORLAND. Seven. The chairman of that board was Gen. Black, who is now Chief of Engineers of the Army of the United States. I want to say further to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] that I need not go any further than his own locality to demonstrate the saving in water rates. Here is one of the exhibits attached to Gen. Black's committee report, which shows that the cost of hauling wheat from Kansas City to Chicago, 451 miles, is 12 cents a hundred pounds, and from Chicago to New York, 812 miles, the cost all rail is 18.8 cents per 100 pounds; rail and lake, 13.7 cents per 100 pounds; and lake and canal, 8.85 cents. So the gentleman's own territory is getting an advantage upon its farm products of an 8.85-cent rate upon wheat, while we of the Southwest are paying 12 cents. What is the cause of the difference in the cost of shipment of the wheat? Nothing, except the question of rail transportation and water competition.

They have the water competition and we have not. Now, let us see what our Kansas friends say about this thing. They had the Kansas millers' convention the other day down in Wichita, and Henry Lassen, who is the president of that organization, said:

"Every farmer and miller in the Southwest is vitally interested in the outcome of the movement to develop the Missouri River," he said. "Nothing can help the Southwest more than the development of the river. I am not speaking against the railroads, because they can not handle all of the business. We need a cheap method of transportation to compete with Minneapolis mills. The latter have lake transportation in their favor. There is nothing that can be shipped better by river than wheat and its products."

"Twenty-five per cent of last year's wheat crop is held in Kansas," said Mr. Lassen. "Under normal conditions, without the shortage in freight cars, not more than 10 per cent would be held within the State."

The present car shortage, Mr. Lassen said, is a breakdown of the delivery system.

Another 100,000,000-bushel wheat crop can be expected this year, Mr. Lassen believes. According to the Wichita miller, wheat conditions are excellent. Although occasional dry spells occurred this winter, the ground was so thoroughly soaked last fall that a wonderful crop will be produced.

Now, the gentleman says that we ought to depend on the railroads. When this project was adopted by Congress it was on the figures of 1907, which were that through the gateway of Kansas City there was passing 5,000,000 tons of commerce. That is the gateway that controls the rates to the Southwest. We adopted this project when there was 5,000,000 tons of commerce going through the gateway of Kansas City. This board found that in 1915 there was 11,000,000 tons of commerce passing through the same gateway, and every pound of that commerce is affected directly or indirectly by water competition. How long are these five railroads going to continue to handle that business between Kansas City and St. Louis? They are not handling it now. In order to double-track one of those existing lines, it will cost \$55,000 a mile. It will cost \$2,500 a mile to keep them up after they are made. That is three-quarters of a million dollars yearly to maintain a rail line to St. Louis, and it will cost two-thirds of that, or \$500,000 to maintain a water line. Does anyone think that the shippers are not going to pay for the additional capitalization of railroads? Who pays for the capitalization of railroads? Is the gentleman right that we are going to save all this money that we do not put into river navigation? And these railroad men say if it was not for the open-water channel they would raise the rail rates into the Southwest to-day if they had the power. And the only thing that keeps them from having the power is that Congress has determined to improve the Missouri River for navigation.

Now, Congress has said, in 1910, that if a railroad reduced its rate to meet water competition, it should not afterwards raise those rates without showing conditions other than eliminating the competition. The railroads have got to a point where they must reduce their rates in competition with river navigation, and the easiest thing for them to do is to stop, if they can, river navigation competition.

Now, why do I say they have reached a point where they have got to reduce their rates? Simply because they are going before the Interstate Commerce Commission pleading that they have the right to readjust rates into the Southwest to meet that competition. In a case before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Case No. 7112, we forced them to make through rates with the boat line on mill products for export from Newport News and Norfolk. If we can compel one railroad to do that we can compel every railroad to make a general joint tariff agreement with the river lines, and as fast as the railroads come in a cheaper route of transportation is open to the shipper on that line of railroad by routing via the boat line.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I will yield.

Mr. PLATT. What you are really for is not water transportation on the Missouri, but to cut down the railroad rates?

Mr. BORLAND. We not only want to, but we are carrying freight. If the gentleman wants to see how we are doing it, I refer him to that same engineer's report, in which he shows that this company has solved the problem of the steel-hulled barges, compartments, noninflammable and nonsinkable barges. The power boats take the barges from the wharf and they are loaded from the car, and as soon as the barge is ready the power boat takes it downstream. And in that way they have solved the competition with rail lines.

Mr. MADDEN. How many of these barges are there?

Mr. BORLAND. Twelve barges now and three power boats.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the capacity?

Mr. BORLAND. The capacity runs from 1,400 tons down to 300.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to ask for five minutes additional. This particular matter, I think, is vital to the whole river navigation problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the order of the committee be changed, and that he be given five additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUCKER: Amend, by inserting at the end of line 7, on page 29, the following:

"Provided, That \$250,000, or so much thereof as may be required, be expended for the permanent improvement of the shores along Carroll and Chariton Counties, at points where the river is leaving its channel, so as to prevent the widening of said river by confining its waters to the present channel, in harmony with the general scheme adopted by the Army Engineers to secure and maintain a 6-foot channel between Kansas City and the mouth of said river."

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss the general proposition, the economic importance of Missouri River improvement, which was so ably discussed by my colleague from Kansas City [Mr. BORLAND] a few moments ago.

Let me remark, however, before addressing myself to the amendment sent to the desk, that I am somewhat surprised at the distinguished gentleman who a few moments ago addressed the committee in opposition to the item of \$1,500,000 for the Missouri River reported by the committee in this bill. The gentleman thinks this is reckless, wanton waste of public funds, and from that side of the aisle every hour during the day admonitions are heard as to the state of the Federal Treasury, and that under the awful conditions which now stare us in the face these appropriations ought not to be asked for or given. And yet nearly every gentleman over there, at least nearly every one of those who have addressed the committee, has done what he could do, and is doing what he can do, to make the condition of the Treasury still more deplorable and lamentable than they tell us it now is. Even the distinguished gentleman who addressed us a few moments ago, and whose analysis so beautifully and logically betrayed the great extravagance we are practicing by leaving this item in the bill, has himself asked for an appropriation from that same depleted and impoverished Treasury for \$75,000 with which to build a post-office building in a town of a little over 2,000 inhabitants. "O, consistency,

thou are a jewel" that is not always found on that side of the aisle! [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Government of the United States has wisely entered upon the project of improving this great river, the Missouri River. It is a sane course to pursue, and I take it that this House by an almost unanimous vote, responding to a sense of duty, will indorse the action of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in reporting the item which is now under consideration. In the scheme of improving the Missouri River necessarily must be involved the scheme of bank protection, in order to keep the river from widening its bed, changing its course, and filling its channel with sand and snags.

The amendment I have offered does not seek to increase the appropriation or to take more money from the Federal Treasury. Its object and purpose is to divert a part of the appropriation authorized by this item to specific work at places where it is grievously needed. Let me say to you we will soon have in here a bill which, I understand unofficially, may carry something like \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 for flood prevention and not one cent to aid in navigation—millions to prevent floods and overflows, and the consequent destruction of crops and damage to lands, without any pretense that this large expenditure is in any sense designed or intended to be expended in securing the navigability of the rivers upon which it will be expended. And yet when we are considering this bill some gentlemen who are likely to encounter no difficulty in voting vast sums of money for flood prevention manifest great concern and anxiety to know whether the intention of amendments like the one I have offered is really in the interest of navigation solely and to the exclusion of shore protection. I am frank to say I am advocating the adoption of an amendment which will authorize, if adopted, the use of money for shore protection. To me it is a self-evident fact that protection of the shore is a necessary incident to permanent improvement of a river in the interest of navigation.

I am not going to discuss the volume of commerce now carried upon the Missouri River nor what increase in volume we may logically and reasonably expect when the river is ultimately put in proper condition. I am going to address myself briefly to the real purpose I have in mind, without any attempt at concealment, appealing to the judgment of this House to sustain my contention. We spend countless millions of dollars to remove sand and dirt from the channels of rivers in order that a sufficient depth may be obtained to float boats loaded with commerce. Those who think as I do believe it to be the part of wisdom and of economic administration to expend comparatively small sums of money to keep the sand out of the channel rather than large sums to take it out after it washes in.

It has been scientifically and accurately ascertained by those competent to deal with the question that the Missouri River actually washes away not less than 10,000 acres of land every 12 months. It gives no additional force to my contention to tell you that this 10,000 acres of land is of incalculable value; that it is fertile and productive, and if saved from the destructive currents of the river would annually afford homes and sustenance for a large number of people. Nor does it strengthen my argument to present the fact that this 10,000 acres of land wasted every year is or was the home of brave, determined, patriotic sons of toil who have, in many instances, spent the best part of a lifetime in establishing their homes. Within my personal knowledge, confined to two counties in my district which border upon this river, great destruction is wrought every year. Not only are the lands washed away, but in many cases the houses which have sheltered families for many years must be quickly removed or they, too, fall a prey to the raging current of the river. These facts, which show conclusively that during every period of 12 months the channel of the river must find lodgment somewhere for 10,000 acres of land distributed down the river, to my mind conclusively shows, also, the wisdom of appropriating money to make secure and permanent the banks of rivers and thus, incidentally, save homes and effectually prevent the large deposit of earth and sand in the river, which must be removed annually in order to keep a sufficient channel for boats to ply the stream. I am glad the old theory that Congress can use public moneys only to aid in securing the navigability of streams, once so largely accepted, has given way to a broader, saner, and more patriotic conception of the power of Congress which now asserts its right to spend public money avowedly and solely for the purpose of preventing damage to property resulting from overflows. If Congress can wisely expend money to prevent destruction of crops by reason of overflows in some sections, then surely no one should hesitate to vote an appropriation of public money to protect the land from which crops are grown and upon which the homes of good people are erected in other sections.

With neither desire nor purpose to conceal the effect of the amendment offered by me, but asserting that I believe the thought is founded in common sense and fair dealing, and that its adoption will be in line with the general plan for the improvement of the Missouri River, and would also protect and preserve the homes of a large number of worthy, loyal citizens of the United States, I earnestly urge the adoption of the pending amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope neither one of these amendments will prevail.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a moment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have only two minutes, but I will yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The district of my colleague Mr. RUCKER lies directly east of mine, and the same conditions exist in my district as exist in his, and the specific diversion of a certain amount of money from this general appropriation would tend to deprive other localities of some of this appropriation. For that reason I question the propriety of making specific appropriations for any particular point.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; that was what I was going to say. I am opposed to this, first, because if we are going to do this work at all, we should go ahead and do it as rapidly as is reasonably practicable. I think the Treasury of the United States can stand it. I should hate to think it could not.

Now, with reference to the second amendment, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], I wish to say we have no estimate from the Engineer's office as to what that class of work will cost. If it is a piece of work that must be done under the project we have already adopted, then the engineers can go ahead under this appropriation and do it; if it is not such a project, then we should not take it up at all, because we do not know what it will cost. We have no project.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. FREAR. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RUCKER. I am satisfied the House did not understand that motion. Otherwise it would have never voted as it did. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Missouri River: For improvement and maintenance from Kansas City to Sioux City, \$50,000, of which amount at least \$25,000 may be expended for such bank revetment as in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers may be in the interest of navigation; continuing improvement and for maintenance from Sioux City to Fort Benton, \$125,000, of which amount at least \$50,000 may be expended for such bank revetment as in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers may be in the interest of navigation; in all, \$175,000.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to a newspaper report on the upper Mississippi, under date of August 21, 1915, from the Chicago Tribune:

OMAHA, NEBR., August 21, 1915.

While Kansas City, Omaha, Sioux City, and other cities are trying to revive steamship traffic on the Missouri River, and are asking Congress for appropriations to deepen the channel, the skeletons of 295 steamboats are rotting in its sands.

Of the 72,339 tons below Sioux City but 8,443 tons were hauled by steamship; the rest, wood and railroad cross-ties, were rafted.

In 1915 there is just one steamship on the river between Sioux City and Kansas City. She is the *Julia*, of 10 tons, and she plies between Omaha and Decatur, 60 miles. The United States Government spent many millions of dollars in order that the *Julia* might operate. On her last trip the *Julia* brought one passenger—the first and only steamship passenger to land in Omaha in 30 years.

Along the same line, the Sioux City Tribune, of November 22, 1915, says:

MISSOURI RIVER TRAFFIC INVESTMENTS.

It is relating how "over \$34,000,000 of river-traffic investments" are demanding the "pork" for the Missouri River. Foolishly it itemizes these "investments."

An analysis of the itemized list shows that of the \$34,688,000 listed as "investments" in Missouri River traffic \$10,000,000 is credited to New Orleans Harbor improvements which are being made for ocean traffic. Of the remaining \$24,688,000, just \$125,000 represents actual investments. The rest shows up in items like these: "Proposed barge

line," "proposed bond issue for terminals," "boat line proposed by private funds," and "estimated proposed bond issue."

This is a sample of the way the country is being deceived. There are no actual investments of any consequence in river traffic, because capital knows river traffic is absurd and impossible. If river traffic were as profitable a competitor to railroads as "pork-barrel" advocates make it out to be, the navigable rivers of the country would be crowded with river steamboats just as they were in the early days, for the rivers are surely as navigable now as they were then. The whole proposition is a fraud.

Now, I want to refer to the engineer's report on this upper Missouri River and to show just how fraudulent, according to the report, some of these estimates are.

Commercial statistics of the Missouri River, Kansas City to Fort Benton, season of navigation, 1913, opened April 1, closed November 15. Freight traffic—

In the general summary of freight traffic they give \$2,013,000; tons, 165,766. In their tonnage is included 115,688 tons of sand.

In their estimate of the value of this traffic the whole amount of which is about \$2,013,000, the contractor's outfit on this stretch of the river is \$925,000, or about one-half of the entire traffic of the river is the contractor's outfit with which he hauls this sand, that makes almost three-fourths of the tonnage.

Mr. Chairman, I have been at a loss to understand how these river navigators argued that such appropriations as are made in river and harbor bills are a good thing for the country, but I have been associated with scientifically educated naval engineers for the last four months and I have their viewpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would like to ask that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BOOHER. Reserving the right to object, I speak on behalf of a gentleman who, I think, will want 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman modify his request?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida modifies his request to 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Associating with these engineers, who are scientific men, educated at Government schools, has given me an insight into their viewpoint on economics; it might be instructive to this House. Possibly that is the view taken by these river navigators, following the Government engineers. I want first to quote a mechanical engineer of very repute, Hudson Maxim. Hudson Maxim was born in Maine. He is a brother of Sir Hiram Maxim, of England, the inventor of Maxim rapid-fire guns. Sir Hiram was titled by the Crown because of his inventions. Hudson married an Englishwoman, stayed in this country, invented smokeless powder, sold out his business to Dupont Powder Co., and entered the employ of that company as chief mechanical engineer. While he is discussing a different subject, he reaches possibly the economic viewpoint of these learned engineers who are figuring on rivers and harbors. He says:

The result is that the nation as a whole is not impoverished in the least by the burden of armaments, but is rather benefited by their support. Also, a nation may likewise be economically benefited by actual war, so long as it has such resources, number of population, industrial arts and sciences, and naval and military equipment as to prevent subjugation and the humiliation and degradation of being forced to pay ransom or tribute in the shape of a large war indemnity to a foreign power.

The money spent by the Government in building fighting ships could not be esteemed so much money lost, even if the ships were useless. The Government taxes the people for the money to build the ships, and then pays the money back to the people again for the ships. The people get their money all back, and the Government gets the ships. The people lose nothing, and the Government is the gainer to the value of the ships. The result is that the fighting ships have cost nothing. On the contrary, their production has benefited all. Everybody is made better and richer through the building of them. When we have looked upon our Navy, remembering what the pacifists have told us about its enormous cost, we are strongly impressed with the colossal expenditure, not realizing that the Navy has actually cost nothing. Its production has been a source of profit and benefit to the people.

I notice in the Army and Navy News, published at San Francisco, Cal., December, 1915, in the discussion of the same subject, the following:

The second alleged reason is utterly without foundation. Military preparedness costs us nothing. The few hundred dollars we spend for imported drugs for the medical departments of Army and Navy is an entirely negligible item. Everything else we get right in the United States, and the money is kept right at home. We construct our own ships and guns in our own yards and factories from materials that come from our own mines. The wool and cotton for clothing come from our own fields; the provisions come from our own farms and ranches. No money leaves the country. It stays right at home, making our shipyards

and factories hum with activity, and providing employment for thousands of good Americans. Instead of being hoarded the money is kept in circulation and everybody is benefited.

But for fear somebody would say these were not up to the standard I want to quote from an admiral who is regarded as one of the brightest in the Navy, Admiral Grant. I quote from his testimony before the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Mr. CALLAWAY. If one has to have his bigger than the other, and the other has got to have his bigger than the one, then what?

Admiral GRANT. You may not know, Mr. CALLAWAY, but I do not see that we are running ourselves to death by building a battleship. Some people consider that money thrown away. I do not, because of every cent that goes into a battleship half of it goes into the labor product and the other half for material goes originally for the labor and material to produce that material. It is not money wasted, in my opinion. You will find it universally stated—that is, a great many men state it—that this \$18,000,000 for this battleship is money wasted and thrown away. I do not consider it so. That is my opinion only.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Your opinion is that the money is still among us?

Admiral GRANT. Yes sir.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And that the \$18,000,000 put into labor and put into material is still with us, and that money is laid out here and there has been no waste at all?

Admiral GRANT. That is my opinion. That is the way I look at it. Mr. HENSLEY. On the same theory, why should we not tear down these magnificent buildings and reconstruct them again?

Admiral GRANT. I do not think that is on the same line at all.

Mr. BRITTEN. We are using the buildings.

Admiral GRANT. I have known in the West, in the early days, of men who furnished money to laboring men to move sand from one side of a lot to the other to give them employment.

Mr. HENSLEY. Do you regard that as a necessity?

Admiral GRANT. Very philanthropic.

Mr. HENSLEY. A good investment?

Admiral GRANT. Good charity.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like three minutes more to finish this quotation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been limited by the committee.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I ask unanimous consent for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the order be modified so as to give him three minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. BOOHER. Reserving the right to object, if the gentleman's time is extended, some one else will want a similar extension.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would not like to extend the time. The gentleman can get time later on, on the next item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida objects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, time has been reserved on behalf of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I will use but two or three minutes, because this does not touch my district, but it does touch my State. I do not know what the virtues of this particular project are. But matters in this bill do not depend upon particular basic facts by themselves, but rather as a matter of relation. And if this upper Missouri River, this classic stream of ours, is not entitled to equal consideration with the rivers of Texas, then I suppose this committee will vote it out. I refer to Texas because that is the State whence hails the gentleman [Mr. CALLAWAY] who is leading the assault upon this project.

These rivers in Texas have stayed in the bill—the Brazos and the Trinity, the latter called Trinity instead of Unity because it is said to stop at two different intervals, leaving it in three sections. As we studied these rivers in the old geography, they started on the plains near the Panhandle and ran to the Gulf, but we learn from their consideration here that they do not run in that direction or even follow gravity; they run from the plains of Texas to the city of Washington. The only live freight they have ever carried in all these years is Congressmen [laughter], save and except they have been followed in one or two historical cases, so graphically described by Hoyt, in "Texas Steers," and then, of course, they carried the dead ones back. [Laughter.]

I merely ask, so far as I am concerned as a Member from Nebraska, that the Missouri River be given the same consideration that is given every other project in this bill. We are claiming it as a matter of relative importance, not particularly in reference to its virtue or the lack of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEPHENS] five minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the item carried in this bill of \$50,000 for the improvement of the Missouri River from Kansas City to Sioux City is used largely for snagging and for the revetment of the banks in several places between Kansas City and Sioux City, where small towns are being endangered and where they have established some navigation.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman define the word "some"?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. "Some navigation" is correct. This river between Omaha and Sioux City has at the present

time two or three small steamboats carrying grain from the inland town of Decatur to Omaha. It is an inland town and has no railroad facilities at all. It has had a small steamer carrying grain and other freight between Omaha and Decatur for two years, I think. Last summer private parties in the town of Decatur provided at their own expense two or three small boats for the purpose of extending this commerce between that inland town and Omaha.

Now, if there ever was a time when there was any excuse whatever for improving this channel, the excuse exists now, because this is the first time in the 25 or 30 years that I have been acquainted with the river that we have done much at all in the way of stimulating the building up of commerce on this stream. The appropriations carried in the bill heretofore have been of immense benefit to the towns along the river in preventing them from being washed away. Three or four years ago a small section of Nebraska containing a population of about 3,000 people would have been washed into the river had it not been for the appropriation carried in this bill at that time which made it possible torevet the banks and keep the stream in its channel. I believe that if there ever was a time when we should carry this item in the bill it is now, when these people are providing means for carrying their commerce between Decatur and Omaha. They have invested many thousands of dollars in these boats. They made an application last year for me to secure the loan from the Government of the flatboats used by the snagging crew. They wanted them to transport grain to Omaha. Some technical provisions of the law prevented this loan; but it does show that the people of this town are doing their best to get water transportation to the metropolitan city of Omaha, and I believe this item should be retained in the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 12207. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

RIVERS AND HARBORS.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Missouri River: For improvement and maintenance from Kansas City to Sioux City, \$50,000, of which amount at least \$25,000 may be expended for such bank revetment as in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers may be in the interest of navigation; continuing improvement and for maintenance from Sioux City to Fort Benton, \$125,000, of which amount at least \$50,000 may be expended for such bank revetment as in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers may be in the interest of navigation; in all, \$175,000.

[Mr. CALLAWAY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Humboldt Harbor and Bay, Cal.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$450,000.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sacramento and Feather Rivers, Cal.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$115,000: *Provided*, That \$10,000 of this amount shall be expended for improvement on the Feather River, subject to the condition precedent that local interests contribute a like sum toward the improvement: *Provided further*, That so much of the river and harbor act of June 3, 1896, as authorizes the appointment of a board of engineers to have charge of the examination, survey, and improvement of Sacramento and Feather Rivers, Cal., is hereby repealed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 2, after the word "maintenance," insert the words "including above Sacramento to Red Bluff."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 3, after the word "bar," insert "and Hoquarton Slough to Tillamook City."

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make available the maintenance of the entire waterway from Tillamook City, from which the greater proportion of the commerce on the waterway arises, to the bar, so that the engineers can use the appropriation of \$5,000 to keep the bay in condition for navigation and also this slough, which is about 5 miles long. The people of Tillamook have raised by taxation from \$2,000 to \$2,500 a year, with which they have been maintaining the navigation on Hoquarton Slough. Under the law that is the limit of money that they can raise. This amendment does not increase the appropriation. The greater proportion of the commerce—85 per cent or more, I am told—goes to and from Tillamook City. If this amount is made available, so that a small portion of it, in case of necessity, can be used for the maintenance of navigation on the Hoquarton Slough on which there is a regular established project of 9 feet at high water, the commerce in that section of the country will be greatly benefited. It does not increase the expense, it simply provides that the engineers can do in the ensuing year what they have been doing for a long period of years, with the exception of the last two years, and I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

It is of great importance to the traffic on the waterway that the water in the slough should be maintained at the depth, at the very least, provided in the existing project, and this is what the amendment will authorize the engineers to do.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail. It is not nearly as harmless as it would appear from the remarks made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY]. As I caught the substance of the amendment it provides that the Government shall do certain work which the people there have undertaken to do. When we adopted the project, we adopted it subject to certain conditions set forth in the project, which this amendment would nullify. That part of the report reads as follows:

In view of all the facts the board believes that the United States would be justified in undertaking the project at a cost of \$814,000, provided the localities to be benefited contribute one-half of said sum and agree to create and maintain an effective channel between Bay City and the city of Tillamook of at least equal capacity to that authorized by the existing project, which provides for a depth of 9 feet at mean high water.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho: Continuing improvement and for maintenance from the mouth to Pittsburg Landing, Idaho, \$25,000.

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this point to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the river and harbor act of 1910 there was a provision for the purchase of a canal and locks around Willamette Falls, Oreg., and the Secretary of War was instructed to enter into negotiations looking to the purchase of that canal. That was for the purpose of assisting navigation in the vicinity of Oregon City, as I understand it. I would like to know from some member of the committee whether the War Department executed that commission intrusted to it by law in 1910?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not just catch the question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has the War Department entered into negotiation for the purchase of existing canals and locks at Willamette Falls in the State of Oregon?

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Government has finally obtained title to the locks at Oregon City. The State of Oregon contributed \$300,000 toward the purchase of the locks and the Government an equal amount.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman simply state in my time what the object of this purchase was?

Mr. HAWLEY. The locks before had been owned by a private company that charged toll—the Portland Railway, Light & Power Co.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much did the Government contribute?

Mr. HAWLEY. Three hundred thousand dollars, and the State contributed \$300,000. All of it is not expended.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Government participated in the purchase of this canal?

Mr. HAWLEY. On equal terms with the State.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What has been done since the canal was purchased?

Mr. HAWLEY. There were many difficulties in the way of securing a title, and the title was only secured this last summer, and the Government intends to make some alterations in the locks to accommodate the traffic. The gate of the lower lock is too near the surface of the water to accommodate larger traffic.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman explain whether tolls were charged on this canal originally?

Mr. HAWLEY. All the time until the Government took it over.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that impeded transportation, of course?

Mr. HAWLEY. It was a burden on transportation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask whether the locks are now free to everybody?

Mr. HAWLEY. They are now free to everybody.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And this is accomplished by the Government entering into a transaction to pay \$375,000?

Mr. HAWLEY. Three hundred thousand dollars, and the State pay \$300,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That was the proportion?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes. There is a plan, as I understand it, for the Government to make some alterations and to make some changes in the locks the better to accommodate the transportation on the river.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What was the tonnage the canal was doing under private ownership?

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not have the figures here at this moment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There was commerce on the canal?

Mr. HAWLEY. There was commerce on the river above the locks to and from way points and to Portland. And at the locks at Oregon City, on the west side, where the locks are located, there were three large paper mills that used the locks all the time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In your judgment, then, it is in the interest of navigation?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And beneficial to the people?

Mr. HAWLEY. Very beneficial.

The Clerk read as follows:

Channel west of Swan Island, Kenebec River, Me., near the town of Richmond.

The Clerk read as follows:

Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Portland, Oreg.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$360,000.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Page 32, line 17, after the word "below," insert the words "Van-couver, Wash., and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mouth of Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$1,200,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the greatest waterway improvements now under way. The appropriation here is for \$1,200,000 for continuing the improvement and maintenance of the mouth of the Columbia River. I presume that is work around the jetties?

Mr. HAWLEY. It is for the completion of the north jetty.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The completion of the north jetty?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does this mean that this is the end of the work on the jetties?

Mr. HAWLEY. One other appropriation may be needed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much has been appropriated thus far on the jetties exclusively, if the gentleman can tell?

Mr. HAWLEY. The amount expended already for the construction is about \$13,000,000, for the work done at the mouth of the river, including the north and south jetties.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. About \$12,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask where the commercial statistics are taken for the Columbia River? Are they taken at Astoria or at Portland?

Mr. HAWLEY. I think they are taken at both places, but most of the commerce, the greater bulk of commerce, arises at Portland.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the tonnage in excess of 4,000,000 for Columbia and its tributaries?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will permit me, I will answer yes. There are 500 ocean-going ships.

Mr. HAWLEY. The tonnage is over 8,000,000 tons.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then it has increased considerably in recent years?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; it is more than 8,000,000 tons annually.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not sure, nor are the engineers sure, that it is going to take another appropriation like this to finish the project. Indeed, they are hopeful that they will get through with it before the appropriation provided for in this bill shall have been expended. I will say, further, that I saw that harbor last year, and I was very much pleased with the work the engineers are doing there. I had been led to believe it would be difficult to complete that channel, because of silt which it was said the stream carried.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Carrying away a part of the jetties at times?

Mr. SPARKMAN. But after going and looking at it and talking with the engineers, I became convinced it was entirely feasible, and that they would complete it perhaps within the estimated cost.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The estimated tonnage, as given here, together with the expenditures already made upon the jetties does not, of course, comprehend the entire Columbia River and its tributaries?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Other improvements are being made along the line, as at Celilo Falls?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is an important project, and I am glad to see it is making such progress.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I desire to correct the statement, made inadvertently, no doubt, by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, last Friday on the floor of the House, in reference to the city of Bicknell, Ind., a flourishing city in my district. The gentleman from Florida gave the population as 2,794. He doubtless was misled by the census report of 1910, which gives the population at that time as 2,794. But it is now a city of more than 9,000 population—a thriving, enterprising city. It is located in the heart of the great coal fields of Indiana. In this locality there are three veins of coal within less than 500 feet of the surface of the earth, aggregating in thickness 21 feet, and some of the largest mines in Indiana—aye, in the Mississippi Valley—are found at the city of Bicknell. The average monthly pay roll is \$250,000 for labor in its mines, aggregating \$3,000,000 per year for wages in this industry alone. It is destined to be one of the most important business places in southwestern Indiana. The coal is of a superior quality, with an almost inexhaustible supply. Its growth has been rapid and substantial, and it is attracting capital desirous of profitable investment. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., at this city, is now putting in yardage costing more than \$300,000, to handle the great amount of traffic furnished at this important business point.

Eastern and northern capital is now arranging to erect a power plant near the city of Bicknell, costing approximately \$1,000,000, for the purpose of producing and transmitting power to the various mines and manufacturing plants in that and adjacent localities. Its growth and enterprise has been marvelous. Its buildings, both business and residential, are substantial and of beautiful design. There is not a vacant residence or business house in this beautiful Indiana city of more than 9,000 population. True it is, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] stated last Friday, in 1910 it had a population of only 2,794, and if he had consulted the census returns of 1900 he would have found at that time it had a population of less than 600. It has prospered in the last six years, and its outlook for the future is very promising, which is most gratifying to its citizens and friends. There is no place in the great Mississippi Valley where coal of such a superior quality can be mined as profitably as in this locality.

Again, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is mistaken when he states its postal receipts are only a little more than \$6,000 per year. Its postal receipts this fiscal year, I am reliably informed by a gentleman in the Post Office Department, will exceed \$10,000; and on the 1st day of July of this year it is to be advanced to a second-class office. I am sure the gentleman from Florida has not investigated its present condition or he would not have made the statement he did, as I

am sure he would not knowingly do this thrifty and enterprising city or its citizens an injustice. I believe he desires to be fair and just to all.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULLOP. I regret I have not the time to yield.

Mr. SWITZER. Does the gentleman know that the Treasury Department will not acquire the site, even after the appropriation is made?

Mr. CULLOP. No; I do not know that. But I will inform the gentleman that this place comes squarely within the rule laid down by the Treasury Department for public buildings, and the conditions there are such as to require one, both from a business and economical standpoint.

Mr. SWITZER. I have one, too, but I do not get a site or an appropriation for it.

Mr. CULLOP. Then the gentleman is in no position to complain if he has been unable to get an appropriation. He could not expect the department to purchase a site, before he secures an authorization. The post office to which I refer is situated in most undesirable quarters, wholly inadequate to accommodate the business of the same, and unsuitable for the work of the employees. Rents are very high, because there is not a vacant business or dwelling house in the city. It is almost impossible to rent a suitable place for the office at a price the Government is authorized to pay. The quarters now occupied by the office are altogether unsuitable for the office in a city of its size and importance. It deserves a more commodious and more appropriate place for the conduct of the business of the Government than can now be secured because of the congested condition of that city, and good business methods require a better and safer building for the office. Private business will pay a better rental for suitable quarters than the Government will pay, and hence the difficulty to procure a proper building in a suitable locality in the city for the office. The city now has free delivery. I am quite sure conditions at this place are such as to comply with the rule promulgated by the Treasury Department to authorize the purchase of a site and the erection of a building, and it would be a good investment for the Government to do so. The gentleman from Indiana was fully within the rule laid down by the department when he introduced his bill for this building, and his proposition in this case is a meritorious one.

Mr. Chairman, repeatedly our Republican friends on that side of the aisle during the consideration of this bill have proclaimed their opposition to the measure because the Government did not have the money to pay the expense of the proposed improvements. Not content with howling calamity about business conditions, they now add to it a plea of national poverty, undertaking to discredit our financial standing before the entire world. This is un-American. The pride of every American should be above such petty partisan politics. Sir, this is not only the most powerful Nation in the world, but it is also the richest. Our national wealth amounts to more than \$225,000,000,000. We are as rich as England, Germany, and France combined, ten times as rich as Italy, eight times as rich as Austria, and four times as rich as France. We are abundantly able to pay for any obligation we may create and thoroughly responsible for all obligations that we may incur. In addition to that we are enjoying the most marvelous era of prosperity the country has ever known, and our people are happy and contented. We are not poverty stricken, as Republican calamity howlers would have the people believe. The people have no patience with the men who are talking about poverty, distress, and calamity.

We are the only great nation in the world enjoying the blessings of peace, while others are torn asunder by desolating war, exhausting their treasure and killing their producers, our Nation is reaping the golden harvests of peace, capturing the commerce of the world, and increasing both the individual and national wealth, the great blessing resulting from our wise domestic and foreign policies. Fortunate, indeed, is our Nation at this time, while the world is passing through the most distressing crisis known throughout the annals of time. The people are wiser, much wiser, than many gentlemen who are talking calamity, poverty, and distress are aware, and they have no patience with such petty partisan politics.

This Nation, with its great resources, its unparalleled wealth, is abundantly able to pay every obligation we shall create without distressing its people or impairing its credit. It is not the question of our ability to pay or to raise the revenue, but the material question is whether the expenditures are provident and what obligations we should incur. This is the crux of the whole matter, and to this proposition we should concentrate our best efforts and use our best judgment. It should then, therefore, resolve itself into purely a business matter, whether we should adopt this or that project. If any are not good business

projects, then they should be rejected and the people not burdened to pay for them. This is the important question, the one for the solution of which we will be held responsible.

Again, I say it is not a sufficient answer to say somebody else at some time in the past did this or that or was going to do so and so. That is no defense for what we are doing now. There should be a better answer, one giving the facts concerning the subject under consideration, so that all may know and understand the basis for the action. People ask for nothing more and want nothing less. They are entitled to have such information, and it should be furnished for their satisfaction. It is an old adage that "two wrongs never make a right," and because somebody else when in power made appropriations for similar projects, which were without merit, for which there was no adequate return, will not suffice as a justification for the commission of a wrong here. We ought to profit by the experience and avoid the pitfall into which they were plunged. If they blundered, made mistakes, we should not repeat them, but avoid them.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grays River, Wash.: For maintenance, \$500.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 33, after line 8, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Improving Willapa Harbor and River, Wash., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 706, Sixty-third Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$100,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract for such work and materials as may be necessary to prosecute the said project, not to exceed in the aggregate \$247,950."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I present this paragraph calling for an appropriation for the improvement of Willapa Harbor and the river of that name because the identical item was in the rivers and harbors bill which passed the last House, but which failed to become a law. The merits of the project are fully set forth in the document to which the paragraph refers. Under the rules which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors act, the improvement of Willapa Harbor must be treated as a new project. Therefore that committee refuses to add the item to this bill, and points to the specially adopted rule for this bill, which provides that no new projects shall be added to it. The committee broke its own rule when it added the New York item, concerning which there was so much consideration in the opening discussion of this measure.

The people of Raymond and South Bend, the cities on Willapa Harbor, are entitled to have their project voted on, in spite of the committee's rule. They should not be asked to wait longer for the commencement of work on their harbor. Work was commenced long ago on the various harbors of the North Pacific, and work continues on most of them. The Willapa Harbor ranks well up with any of them, not only as to its depth of water, its safety, and its tonnage, but is fully entitled to improvement by the Government engineers on the authority of Congress in accordance with the paragraph I have submitted and on which I ask a vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in regard to this project that Willapa Harbor is one of the chief harbors of the Pacific Northwest. The amount of traffic there last year was over \$5,000,000. It is a terminus of the Northern Pacific Railroad, and the Milwaukee Railroad has also recently reached this harbor. There is more standing timber tributary to Willapa Harbor than to any other seaport in the United States. I think the policy of the committee in continuing to improve some projects that to say the least are questionable, while great projects like this go unimproved, is a mistake. This is for a 24-foot project, and all the traffic that I have mentioned is foreign traffic. With the shoaling up of this bay that traffic must cease. This project is of highest merit and should go into this bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not prevail. I believe it is true that it was inserted in the bill of 1914, along with 60 or 70 other projects which have been left out of this bill. I am further under the impression, without committing myself to it right now, that it is a good project that perhaps ought to be adopted, but we can not undertake to care for it without adopting a great many others equally as meritorious.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Page 33, after line 8, insert:

"Improving Skagit River, Wash.: Completing improvement at Skagit City Bar in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, contained in House Document No. 935, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$30,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there could not be a better illustration of what is being done in this bill. The Skagit River is the largest river that flows into Puget Sound. Last year the traffic on that river amounted to about \$5,500,000. This bar is forming only a few miles from the mouth of the river, and, unless something is done, in the course of another year it is liable to obstruct, if not entirely stop, the navigation on that stream. Here is a river that has about five times as much traffic as the Missouri. A little while ago we gave \$1,500,000 to the Missouri, but here is a river that carries five times as much traffic, which is liable to be entirely stopped for the want of an appropriation of \$30,000, which the committee have refused to incorporate in this bill because it is a new project.

It shows where we are going under this rule of continuing to complete projects, some of them that are not worthy of completion, and refusing to adopt new and worthy projects of this character. Take it in this particular instance, where \$30,000 is needed for a five and a half millions of traffic, and evidence showing that there is an actual saving on freight and passengers of \$37,501. That is not speculative, but it is according to the evidence submitted in the report. I offer this amendment to call attention once more to the policy we are pursuing. I was one who voted to take on new projects. The reason was that there were several others of like character to this, where, by appropriating a few thousand dollars, you can accommodate a tremendous traffic; but instead of that we let the traffic suffer, or perhaps to be entirely destroyed, while we appropriate millions for rivers where they have very little traffic and where there would be no damage to the traffic if we did not continue to improve it.

I trust that this is the last bill of this character to be reported to the House; that unless we can take on new projects and appropriate where the traffic demands it, that we will stop having a river and harbor appropriation bill entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Coquille River, Oreg.: For maintenance, \$6,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We have passed an item of \$348,000 for a waterway connecting Lakes Union and Washington. It is for continuing the improvement. I find in the report that there was a local cooperation on this project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the gentleman ask to go back to that item?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There were reasons why I did not make the motion at the time we passed it, but I have no desire to go back to the item. I am merely discussing the State of Washington improvements before we pass on to Hawaii.

The report of the committee shows that there was a local cooperation on this project which was to connect Lakes Union and Washington. The contemplated cost was over \$3,300,000, and there was local cooperation to this extent, as the report states:

The right of way and the flowage rights were secured by the United States by King County and accepted as satisfactory by the Secretary of War June 20, 1909.

I want to ask whether there was a canal connecting Lake Union and Lake Washington before the project was approved?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Only a very small canal, but it was recognized by the Government as navigable and was used only to run logs.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Lake Union is above Lake Washington?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; Lake Washington is above Lake Union and Puget Sound is below Lake Union. Lake Washington is 8 feet above Lake Union and Lake Union is 8 feet above Puget Sound.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A kind of water terrace. The idea was to connect Lake Washington with Puget Sound?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; this appropriation completes this great work. It has the greatest lock on the North American Continent outside of those at Panama.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This appropriation of \$348,000 will finish up the work?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; and what the Government has done is to furnish the locks. The local authorities furnished the right of way and did the excavating and the Government has furnished the lock and excavated below the lock.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did any Federal money go into the purchase of the canal?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to commend the gentleman from Washington. He was on the committee at the time the project was inaugurated, and he has stood steadfastly by it. I have been over the two lakes and Puget Sound. It is a great project. I also agree with the gentleman from Washington that there has been a little too much hesitancy on the part of the Rivers and Harbors Committee in not taking on new projects in this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think there is any prospect in the near future of anybody connected with the Dismal Swamp Canal or the Albemarle Canal turning over any property that they own to the Government of the United States without expense?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I accept the gentleman's remarks as facetious. The gentleman knows why I am asking these questions.

Mr. MADDEN. They are serious.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is no reason why one canal should be taken over more than another, if they have equal merit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at San Juan, P. R.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Mr. COADY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the importance of the bill (H. R. 12643) introduced by my colleague [Mr. TALBOTT] on March 3, 1916, and which provides for an appropriation of \$125,000 for the dredging of Curtis Bay Channel, Baltimore Harbor, to a depth of 35 feet from the Patapsco River Channel to and into Curtis Bay. This channel is now 30 feet deep and 250 feet wide, and the adoption of the Talbott bill and the expenditure of the amount of money it provides would give it an additional depth of 5 feet, making altogether 35 feet. This would give the Curtis Bay Channel the same depth of the Patapsco Channel, with which it connects at a point a few miles below the main harbor of Baltimore, and would enable large ships coming into our port to use this bay as well as the Patapsco River.

Curtis Bay is commercially a part of Baltimore. The large commercial and manufacturing plants that are located on it, and they are many, are operated and financed by Baltimore business men. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. has a large coal pier at the head of this bay that is capable of loading 3,000,000 tons of coal annually on vessels. This railroad company has another such pier in course of erection which when completed will cost \$1,500,000. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. is said to be seeking a site on these waters on which to erect a large terminal station for the handling of freight.

An increased commercial development will surely follow these improvements. No better place than Curtis Bay for loading naval colliers exists along the Atlantic seaboard.

It is close to the coal fields of Western Maryland and West Virginia, and the Baltimore & Ohio is one of the largest coal-carrying roads in the United States.

The collier *Newton* was loaded at one of these piers with 7,500 tons of coal in three and three-fourths hours.

Real preparedness includes proper facilities for the rapid coaling of the colliers that supply our ships of war with fuel.

The deepening of this channel should be a part of our preparedness program. With only 30 feet of water there may be danger of the grounding of one of these big colliers when loaded to its full capacity.

Baltimore city has expended large sums of money in the work of improving its main harbor and has cooperated with the United States in providing approaches to the channels. Up to this year of 1916 it spent over \$11,700,000 for harbor improvements and it is now spending \$250,000 on its inner harbor. Last year our tonnage was over 13,500,000 tons. We have 34 steamboat and steamship lines, and over 13,000 boats engaged in the bay and coastwise trade.

This project is recommended by United States engineers. An Acting Secretary of the Navy has recommended it and has

called attention to its superior advantages as a coaling place for our war vessels. He has said that this improvement would be of the greatest value to the Navy in admitting the latest type of naval colliers to the railroad piers for loading coal; that Curtis Bay is one of the chief loading ports for the Navy, and it might easily become a valuable asset in time of war.

Col. Beach, of the United States Engineers, has said that this contemplated improvement is of more than local importance and it affects the whole country in its influence upon the supply of coal for the Navy.

This improvement is bound to be of great benefit to our commerce, an aid to navigation, and a great advantage to our Navy in the coaling of its ships.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That for examinations, surveys, and contingencies for rivers and harbors for which there may be no special appropriation, the sum of \$250,000 is hereby appropriated: *Provided*, That no preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate for new works other than those designated in this or some prior act or joint resolution shall be made: *Provided further*, That after the regular or formal reports made as required by law on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless ordered by a concurrent resolution of Congress: *And provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until funds for the commencement of the proposed work shall have been actually appropriated by law.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 34, line 4, after the word "law," insert:

"The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause re-examinations and surveys to be made upon such projects as are now receiving allotments for maintenance or improvement which were adopted more than 10 years ago. A report shall be made to Congress which shall contain the recommendations of the engineers whether or not in their judgment the projects shall be continued and whether reasons for their original adoption still apply."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the adoption of this amendment would in a way do away with a good deal of criticism that we have heard in the debate on this bill. We have adopted in years gone by projects which later on have not appeared to have as much merit and to be of as great benefit to the waterways of the country as they appeared to be at the time of their adoption. There are projects for which we have voted money in the course of the reading of this bill adopted many years ago. One of the objections I have had to the lump-sum appropriation scheme, which has been the method for the appropriations in the last two bills, is the fact that the engineers seem to regard as instructions from Congress any adopted project, no matter what the merits might be at the time they were allotted money for it and no matter what the opinion of Congress might be toward the project at the present time.

It seems to me that we ought to have further information on which we can base our opinions in the future as to the relative merits of projects before us. It is in no sense a criticism of the committee; it is in no sense a criticism of the method of the making up of the bill. It is simply a means by which we can secure the very latest opinions of the engineers as to the merits of the projects that may be before us looking for appropriations for improvement or maintenance.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman mean that the reexamination ought to be from an engineering standpoint or from a commercial standpoint?

Mr. TREADWAY. Of course, the engineers express to us only their views from an engineering standpoint. They do not pretend to express any commercial views.

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, I think that would not be the effect of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. TREADWAY. We ask for the opinion of the Board of Engineers from their standpoint.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the effect that a specific provision was put in the river and harbor act of last year requiring the reexamination of certain projects; and the engineer reexamined the Missouri River, and the report was that from an engineering standpoint it is sound, but the engineer reported against this on commercial grounds, without holding any hearings, without calling anyone before him, and without consulting any shipper in the district.

The bill was passed on the 4th of March and he prepared his report on the 22d of April, and it turned out on hearing that his report as to commercial conditions was absolutely valueless. He reported that the engineering plan was sound. Which kind of a report does the gentleman expect to get?

Mr. TREADWAY. I desire from the engineers a report on all projects now before Congress that were adopted 10 years ago. In recent years, the gentleman well knows, no project has been adopted which the engineers have not first recommended.

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly.

Mr. TREADWAY. I did not attempt to specify as to what kind of a recommendation they should make, nor do I desire to make particular reference to the gentleman's project on the Missouri River. It is nothing in the nature of a particular item to which I refer. I have no idea when the Missouri River project was adopted. As one member of the committee I find that we are in a way very largely in the dark as to the merits of projects at the present time, and I think it is no more than right that Congress should have a revised opinion from the Board of Engineers as to the merits of projects for which we are asked to appropriate money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will not prevail, because it is totally unnecessary. Under the provisions of section 14 in the river and harbor act of 1915 the engineers are going on and doing exactly what the gentleman's amendment would provide for. As I caught the drift of the amendment, he has confined it to some period anterior to 10 years from this date. The provision in the 1915 act does not curtail the powers or duties of the engineers in any particular in the matter of such examinations, but gives them full power in that regard, and they are going ahead under that provision examining all these projects and are making reports from time to time, so that this amendment is wholly unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like a minute or two.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts in the idea that there ought to be periodical reports of the engineers as to the engineering features of the projects. That is what the engineers are supposed to look after. Then if it turns out that Congress is proceeding on a false basis and the engineering feature of it is not feasible, the engineers ought to stop the expenditure of money. But it seems to me that the River and Harbor Committee ought to have some means, and I would rather assume that they did, of holding hearings on each project before they bring in a bill to determine whether a continued improvement is necessary from a commercial standpoint. It seems to me that particular phase of the question is peculiarly within the consideration of the committee. I believe they should hold hearings as to whether a particular project ought to be appropriated for. That is not a question within the jurisdiction of the engineers at all. The engineers determine whether the project is feasible from an engineering standpoint, and if it turns out that it is not, they ought to make report, whether it is a 10-year-old project or a 1-year-old project, that that project ought to be discontinued or modified.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am going to vote for this bill, and I wish to make a few observations in reference to the general policy that is pursued in the improvement of our inland waterways.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. About seven minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in eight minutes, and I reserve one minute for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, as to the high dam at Minneapolis, that project was commenced 22 years ago through the efforts of Senator Washburn, who is long since dead. It was nursed along by Congressman Fletcher, and he has been out of Congress for 10 years. It was assisted by Congressman Nye, who was here for 6 years, and I have been here for 4 years. Twenty-two years have passed since this project was undertaken. It was estimated at that time that it would cost only \$1,166,000. But we have spent \$2,200,000 on the project and still we have only 87½ per cent of it perfected.

Portions of the dam have gone out twice, and there is great disappointment among the friends of this dam because it did not go out this year. However, it came nearly going out.

I have no criticism of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I simply make these observations for the purpose of calling attention to matters in connection with our system of improving inland waters. We turn over to the Board of Engineers the question of determining whether or not these projects are feasible, and after the Board of Engineers determine they are feasible, we turn them over to the Board of Engineers to be constructed, and after the board has taken on the work they come before Congress year after year for appropriations to continue the work, and Congress grants the requests and recommendations of the engineers as a matter of course, until, in my locality, the cost of the project has more than doubled the original estimates.

There are no engineering features connected with the high dam at Minneapolis that makes it difficult. It is simply a dam erected between high stone walls. Each year for the last three years the people of this locality have been given to understand that the dam would be completed. I know there are institutions in my community that wish this dam were never built. For example, the Minneapolis General Electric Co., which owns five other dams in this community, is not ready to take it over. The longer it is delayed the better so far as this company is concerned. They own three dams that are undeveloped, and they are not ready for this dam; and so year after year we go on building this dam, letting the water wash it out and then replacing it. It is a "pork barrel" bill, they say, but for whom? For the railroads of this country? For the hydroelectric companies in this country? Certainly not for the people of my community, because every dollar you put into that dam, whether the power is leased to the General Electric Co. or whether it shall belong to the State of Minnesota and the Twin Cities, the people of that community will have to pay dividends, or rent, on that dollar for all time to come, and the General Government will derive no benefit, because it has parted with its dollar. Why this increased cost, and why this delay? That is the question for the committee to ascertain. About 10 miles farther up the Mississippi River the Minneapolis General Electric Co., within the last three years, erected a dam that develops practically the same amount of power that this dam develops. It only took the company a little over a year to erect this private dam.

They will have to pay a rental that will yield a fair return on the cost of the dam, and the more you can make it cost the more we will have to pay. Do you think my people are anxious that year after year their Congressmen shall bring home "pork" to them in the shape of an item in the river and harbor bill? Why, gentlemen, my constituents are not so foolish as that; your constituents are not so foolish as that.

I say that the time has come when the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of this House that has worked so hard and so nobly for these projects should ascertain why these projects are not completed; why they are delayed year after year. Who is going to put his money into navigation equipment until he is certain that the rivers are to be made navigable and kept so? Why, the debate that has taken place in this House during the last week would scare any man who had a dollar to invest and who wanted to go into the navigation business.

I know of no better way to destroy the hope of ever getting inland waterway navigation than to continue the performance that we have had during this and the preceding Congress over the river and harbor bill.

These are the observations that I want to call to the attention of the House. I believe in inland waterways. I believe they are necessary to the transportation system of this country. I know that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has worked hard in behalf of these projects, but it is time that somebody be jacked up; it is time that these projects should be brought to completion.

Gentlemen, I am not for public ownership. I believe that wherever possible private enterprise should be given an opportunity to develop the great industries of the country, but here we have a situation in which private enterprise has become highly monopolized, and every move that is made by the public seems to be directed toward helping that monopoly to get a still firmer hold upon the rights of the public. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Buzzards Bay, Mass., at its upper end, with a view to providing additional anchorage area and improving the approaches to the Cape Cod Canal, in so far as it may be the duty of the United States to improve the same.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS: Page 34, line 18, after the paragraph ending with the word "same," insert:
 "Quinnipiac River, Conn., from New Haven Harbor to Meriden.
 "Naugatuck River, Conn., between the head of navigation at Derby and Waterbury, Conn., with a view to the construction of a barge canal."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in view of the criticism directed against certain waterways provided for in this bill, each of which has a tonnage of more than 100,000 tons a year, I desire to call attention to what Mr. Burton, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors—afterwards Senator—said in the House on March 17, 1902:

I think that it will be conceded by all that when a waterway has a tonnage of over 100,000 per annum it is worthy of attention and of the fostering care of the Government.

I want also to remind gentlemen that there has been criticism because the Government is improving some of the short waterways, called "creeks." Here is what Senator Burton said March 17, 1902, concerning this argument:

The Interstate Commerce Commission has prepared, at my request, a statement of the tonnage on certain of the minor railroads of the country. I selected at random 16 railroads, the shortest of which has a mileage of 11.78 miles and the longest of 253.7 miles, and found that of these 8 had a tonnage of less than 100,000 per annum, varying from 3,310 tons on one railway having a length of 44 miles to 59,146 tons on one having a mileage of 86 miles, and if we select the one having the largest tonnage on a short mileage, 98,000 tons on a railroad having a mileage of 11.78 miles.

Yet it will appear that each one of these railroads is capitalized for a very considerable sum. The following is a list of them:

Statement of mileage and tonnage of certain roads for the year ending June 30, 1901.

Name of road.	Miles operated.	Tons carried.	Tons carried 1 mile.
Clarendon & Pittsford R. R.	11.78	98,586	443,637
Buffalo, Attica & Arcade R. R.	28	31,620	342,492
Queen Anne's R. R.	67	29,831	825,231
Dayton, Lebanon & Western R. R.	23	62,120	836,300
Birmingham & Atlantic R. R.	42.46	62,005	1,165,884
Nashville & Knoxville R. R.	86.80	59,146	1,951,818
Leavenworth & Topeka Ry.	56.12	12,027	321,852
Florida Midland R. R.	44	3,310	46,721
Total.....		358,645	5,933,935

So that it will appear on examination that this criticism that ponds and creeks are absorbing a great share of these river and harbor bills is absolutely without foundation.

He gives a list of the tonnage of some of these creeks: Racoon Creek, N. J., 172,000 tons; Mantua Creek, N. J., 188,000 tons; Cooper Creek, 230,138 tons; Duck Creek, Del., 348,728 tons; East Chester Creek, N. Y., 300,000 tons.

Mr. Chairman, early during this debate I called attention to what I thought was an error in the minority report of my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. He says in the minority report, and the House will remember it—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to continue for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph end in five minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman make it five minutes more? I have not answered before—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then I would like to have 10 minutes, and give the gentleman 10.

Mr. FREAR. All right. That is perfectly satisfactory, if the House wants it; but I object otherwise.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes to be used by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] and five minutes to be used by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] said in his report that we had expended more than

\$850,000,000 for our waterways. The gentleman corrected me when I called attention to that statement by saying that what he meant was that that amount had been appropriated instead of expended. But in his speech of January 13, 1916, made some weeks before the minority report was filed, he said:

Mr. Speaker, we have paid out of the Government Treasury over \$850,000,000 for our waterways.

The gentleman's language in the speech was "paid out of the Government Treasury." That shows what the gentleman understood when in his report he used the word "expenditure." The gentleman in his minority report asks the specific question:

What policy has governed the expenditure of \$850,000,000 on waterways since 1875?

There can be no mistake about the the meaning of the expression—

We have paid out of the Government Treasury \$850,000,000—

Nor about the meaning of the question—

What policy has governed the expenditure of \$850,000,000 on our waterways since 1875?

Now, I have a statement which I procured at the office of the Chief of Engineers from Col. Taylor, who examined the records and gave me these figures:

The amount expended prior to June 30, 1875, was \$54,570,505; the amount on hand January 1, 1916, unexpended money appropriated, \$38,833,721. Together these make an aggregate of \$93,404,226 less than the amount of money which this minority report said had been expended between 1875 and 1916. In other words, when the gentleman in his speech said that we had "paid out of the Treasury" \$850,000,000, and in his report that we had "expended" the same amount since 1875, he made an error, according to the figures of the War Department, of more than \$93,000,000.

I merely called attention to that because I thought it a mistake. And it was a mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin who his expert, Prof. Moulton, is, and where he is a professor?

Mr. FREAR. I will answer in my own time.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to have the information.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman has not yielded to me heretofore, and I will answer him in my own time.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, there was no offense in that. The gentleman has repeatedly refused to yield to other persons. I do not know who this professor is except that I have his book here, in which his name is given as Harold G. Moulton. The preface is dated February, 1912, and closes with these words:

Above all, I am deeply grateful to Prof. J. Laurence Laughlin, who inspired the work and who gave his worthy criticism at every stage of the writing.

Mr. Laughlin is a professor in Chicago University.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, within three years we have witnessed a phenomenal growth in sentiment against reckless waste and extravagance in public affairs. Less than a decade ago Senator Aldrich stated that Government extravagance caused over \$300,000,000 waste in appropriations every year. This waste is not confined to any single appropriation bill, but is found in many of the large bills that for years passed practically unchallenged.

Private claims involving comparatively insignificant amounts receive close scrutiny, but not so with large pork-barrel appropriations that generously carry something for communities all over the country. Personal or locality interest creates a barrier to thorough, careful, businesslike accounting, whether it be for waterways or nitrate plants.

It may not be time wasted to refer briefly to what has been accomplished in arousing public sentiment and official action against wasteful waterway legislation.

One hundred and thirty-three votes have been recorded against the 1916 bill and 149 in favor of the \$20,000,000 substitute bill. That is great progress.

Three years ago scarcely a dozen Members arose to protest against the passage of the 1914 \$43,000,000 river and harbor bill. For days all opposition had been derided, and amid laughter and ridicule the handful of Members was hopelessly outvoted and outshouted. Gentlemen with a "few unnecessary observations" created much amusement by suggesting that new Members frequently used the pork barrel as a target, but soon became convinced that the inside of the barrel is not so black as it is painted.

Three years ago the committee was gravely informed that there could be no just criticism of waterway projects, because one and all were approved by Army engineers. Army engineers are among the honor men of the Military Academy, and criticism

of an Army engineer was alleged to be a direct attack on Col. Goethals, who built the Panama Canal. That was the refrain sung in unison by those who had projects at stake in the bill.

Again three years ago the red danger flag of "railroads" was swung by those who had big appropriations hanging fire. Any man who asked for facts or pointed out waste was alleged to be acting for railways, an arch enemy of waterways. The critic of river and harbor bills was declared to be looking for notoriety or else disgruntled because he had failed to land something for his own constituency. Pork hunting was declared to be a legitimate game, practiced from time immemorial, and any man who refused to play the game must be governed by ulterior and selfish motives.

Even men of standing who believed in the old order of things denounced honest criticism as "bunk." Realizing that conditions are wrong, they said that condition is a necessary accompaniment of representative government.

Three years ago a corporal's guard was howled down when the 1914 vicious river and harbor bill sailed through the House. Two years ago the 1915 bill, submitting to public sentiment, eliminated new projects but clung to every scandalous, wasteful, old proposition wherever located. The malcontents, discontents, and opponents of waste reached about 80 votes against the bill when in 1915 it tumbled over opposition in the House, but public confidence in the infallibility of Army engineers received a body blow in 1915 through a defeat of the Muscle Shoals item contained in that bill.

APPROVALS BY ARMY ENGINEERS.

Army engineers were backed by the present Chief of Engineers, Col. Black, then chairman of the board. A proposition from Army engineers to give \$18,700,000 to a private water-power company in Alabama was involved in the Muscle Shoals item. Vicious and indefensible in character, it gave a rude shock to those who had lauded the disinterestedness and independence of Army engineers. Notwithstanding it was fought for hard and long by Democratic leaders, the House began to find an objectionable smell to the bill and to many of its innocent-looking projects, and for the first time in years an item involving eventually many million dollars was struck out.

The 1916 river and harbor bill has been under discussion for many days. Formerly it was put through in a few hours, but now it receives serious consideration. True, the committee, as a whole, swings a powerful influence, but for the first time in years three members filed minority reports and voted against the bill. Two hundred and seventy projects, distributed along the coast from Portland, Me., to Portland, Oreg., and from Minnesota to Mississippi, also hold a fair percentage of votes for the bill, but no man can be oblivious to the significance of a vote reaching 159, counting 10 pairs, in favor of the \$20,000,000 substitute, which would permit a saving of nearly \$20,000,000, or of 143 votes, counting 10 pairs, cast squarely against the 1916 river and harbor bill.

No champion of Army engineers will discount the significance of a vote in committee by 40 majority, which directs engineers to enter into no more contracts with private dredging concerns, at a profit of more than 25 per cent above the cost of performance by a Government plant. Suspicious contracts, carrying 80 per cent profit, like those let in the Norfolk-Beaufort Waterway, will now receive careful scrutiny.

SUSPICIOUS PRIVATE DREDGING CONTRACTS.

It is hard to find any reasonable explanation for such contracts between engineers and dredgers, when official reports show, first, that \$200,000 is sufficient to keep busy the Government plant now on that Norfolk-Beaufort project; and, second, that private dredgers on the same job charge the Government for the same work 80 per cent more than it costs when performed by a Government crew. Yet, on an indefensible, useless, \$5,400,000 canal proposition, recommended by Army engineers, instead of asking for only \$200,000 for the Government crew, the official estimate asks \$1,000,000 for 1916 on that one project. More significant, the 1916 bill carries \$1,000,000, of which \$800,000 is for private dredging contracts, costing 80 per cent more than Government work.

Correspondence submitted to the House showed that the Dredgers' Protective Association has in the past pushed and pulled hard for river and harbor pork barrels; that confidential lists of dredgers were furnished to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, as a basis for securing contributions to that famous \$50,000,000 annual river and harbor lobby; and that these same dredgers in the past have divided up Government contracts among themselves by allotment.

With these alleged facts exposed and before the House, the Chief of Engineers, Col. Black, wrote a long letter to Chairman SPARKMAN, protesting against any limitation in dredging con-

tracts, notwithstanding private dredgers are fattening off Government contracts all over the country to-day.

In his letter, read to the House, Col. Black says:

At the present time it is believed that contracts are let at prices which are as low as will permit the contractors to maintain their plant and make any profit whatever.

The least said about Col. Black's judgment and opinion, the better; but it calls to mind one or two other significant expressions from the man Congress has placed in a position of unparalleled financial responsibility, from the determination of private dredging and building contracts aggregating over \$30,000,000 annually to a decision of just how much shall be put into specific projects annually, or where \$20,000,000 nitrate factories shall be established.

Let us ascertain how far his judgment is entitled to our confidence in view of the unlimited power he assumes and which we surrender to him. We will not forget the Muscle Shoals recommendation of \$8,575,000 for enormous dams and locks, to accommodate 6,000 tons of annual "commerce." We will not forget the fact that Col. Black, the present Chief of Engineers, on page 6 of House Committee Document No. 20, Sixty-third Congress, chairman of the Board of Army Engineers, overruled Col. Riché on the subject of giving to a water-power company \$1,750,000 more for flowage rights.

A PRESENT OF \$1,750,000 TO A POWER COMPANY.

Let me make the statement clear as shown by that document: Col. Riché agreed to a proposition to give \$8,575,000 for "navigation" to a 26-mile canal but he balked over flowage damages, and said on page 57 of Document 20:

I recommend all lands and easements be donated to the United States and do not fear delay will result in loss to the United States or prevent the improvement of Muscle Shoals.

In response to this proposal Col. Black, then chairman of the board, in overruling Riché, significantly said, page 6:

It would doubtless lead to considerable delay and would be apt to defeat the present opportunity to make this improvement on favorable terms.

Congress has since learned what this opportunity provided: First, the privilege of giving \$8,575,000 toward navigation down among the sand hills of Alabama, to accommodate 6,000 tons of questionable annual commerce; second, the privilege of giving \$1,750,000 additional for flowage rights in order to help out the same astounding proposition; and, third, the further privilege of loaning to the Muscle Shoals Hydro-Electric Power Co., J. W. Worthington, president, an additional sum of \$8,375,000, payable back in installments during the course of 100 years.

It was Col. Black, now Chief of Engineers, who recommended that the Government give \$18,700,000 to this indefensible project which is similar in character to the nitrate proposition contained in section 82, recently stricken from the Hay Army bill when before the House.

Congress might be disposed to overlook the letter sent by the Chief of Engineers to Congress protesting against any limitation on dredgers' contracts, notwithstanding the unsavory facts surrounding prior contracts and the unbusinesslike, astounding proposal from Col. Black on the Muscle Shoals project; but other significant evidences of failure to grasp simple economic propositions and the interests of the Federal Treasury indicate that no measure calculated to safeguard the Treasury should be overlooked.

Let me quote from Col. Deakne, an Army engineer, who recently protested in House Document No. 463, Sixty-fourth Congress, against the wasteful Missouri River \$20,000,000 project. He said:

The total freight charge on (1914) traffic was about 41,000 tons. The Kansas City (Mo.) River Navigation Co., the only through line on the river operating between Kansas City and St. Louis, charges 80 per cent of the railroad freight rates. Assuming this to be the relation between the rail and water rates for the entire traffic (37,551 tons), the saving to shippers by the use of the river in 1913 was about \$10,000. It is evident that this saving is entirely inadequate to warrant the serious consideration of an expenditure by the Government of \$1,100,000 per year in interest and maintenance.

This is what Deakne wrote when recommending an abandonment of the \$20,000,000 Missouri River project—a river on which the Government has already expended over \$20,000,000 and on which a balance of \$14,000,000 is recommended by Army engineers.

Col. C. McD. Townsend, chairman of the Mississippi River Commission and division engineer, indorsed in substance the Deakne recommendation for abandonment of the Missouri River project, excepting \$150,000 annually was recommended for snagging and dredging in lieu of the proposed project that asks \$14,000,000 more in cash and \$500,000 for annual maintenance.

Col. Black, who wrote the letter protesting against any interference with dredgers' contracts, and who recommended the \$18,700,000 private water-power proposition at Muscle Shoals, by

a singular coincidence is the same Col. Black who is now Chief of Engineers and was the former chairman of the board that on December 8, 1915, overruled Col. Deakyne and Col. Townsend. In doing so he says of the Missouri River, on page 7 of Document No. 463:

It has been estimated that with the channel held by revetted banks there would be available for agricultural purposes in the bottom land along the river between Kansas City and St. Louis 500,000 acres, the greater part of which would be less than a mile distant from the river, and a considerable portion of which is now necessarily nonproducing. It is claimed that this area would contribute very substantially to the river traffic.

And he overruled Deakyne and Townsend and recommended that \$14,000,000 more be expended with an accompanying annual interest and maintenance expense to the Government of \$1,100,000 on the Missouri River.

PRIVATE BENEFICIARIES AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE.

No man expects the owners of 500,000 acres of reclaimed land to become enraged over the Government's reclamation of their lands without expense to them. That is Col. Black's proposition.

Nor would it be reasonable to expect the Alabama Power Co. to be wrathful over Col. Black's recommendation that \$18,700,000 be advanced by the Government to its water-power project. In fact, it is not to be expected that the army of dredgers would object to a longer lease in their unlimited dredging contracts as proposed by the Chief of Engineers, but Congress is beginning to inquire into these matters, and as a result the Muscle Shoals project, although recommended by Col. Black, was stricken from the last River and Harbor bill and the Missouri River item of \$1,500,000 in the 1916 bill had a narrow squeak in the Committee of the Whole while the proposal to longer lease dredgers' contracts without limitation received a pronounced backset by over 40 majority.

Who says the world is not moving when Congress awakens to the way in which it has been misled by army engineers? This bill now goes to another legislative body where the protest against limiting dredgers' contracts will again be urged. But what shall be said of leaving to army engineers the absolute determination of such contracts when it is discovered that under an innocent item in the 1915 bill granting a resurvey of a portion of the Tennessee River, engineers expended in 1915 upwards of \$150,000, on borings at Muscle Shoals, in order to prepare for the Alabama Water Power Co. project which was stricken out of the 1915 bill?

OTHER QUESTIONABLE ITEMS IN THE 1916 BILL.

I have briefly referred to projects and recommendations which destroy confidence in the judgment of Army engineers, who in turn now object to restricting profits on private dredging contracts. What shall be said of many small items in the 1916 bill of the character of Cold Spring Harbor, N. J., a notorious real estate scheme for which the Government has already given \$961,000. It carries \$40,000 in this bill, and was originally recommended by Army engineers, who stated in Document 388, Fifty-ninth Congress:

The project will be of material benefit to the city of Cape May as a pleasure resort by filling the adjacent swamp lands, obliterating mosquito-breeding beds, and furnishing opportunity for expansion of building sites.

The Engineer's report further urges that "improvement" in order to secure a removal of the Tom Lipton yacht races from New York to Atlantic City, see page 5.

This proposal need not surprise those who will learn from Document 346, Sixtieth Congress, that Toms River, which floated 92 tons of commerce in 1914—

is located on one of the three principal automobile lines of travel. * * * Suitable depth in the river would increase this traffic, owing to the ease with which owners could communicate with their yachts at this point.

And pursuant to the Engineers' recommendation our Government is now keeping the river open to accommodate private yacht owners.

The Toms River proposition is no more absurd than for the Government to be spending hundreds of thousands of dollars every year in a perpetual-motion job by pulling deadheads out of the Pearl, Leaf, Red, and other rivers for the use of milling and logging companies that practically have the exclusive use of such streams.

Where is the limit of engineering proposals when on the St. Francis River, Ark., it requires prodding in the mud to determine any line of demarcation between the marsh and a river along which the Government has been reclaiming lands now valued at \$88,874,000, according to a report of a Memphis trust company.

Nor are Army engineers' reclamation proposals of private lands at Government expense more unreasonable in theory than for the Government to cut water hyacinth from Florida and Mississippi creeks and rivers in an effort to promote "commerce." Millions of dollars are spent by the Government annually in reclaiming overflowed private lands, all under the cloak of navigation, and it is significant that all these projects have the indorsement of Army engineers who now object to any limit being placed on private dredging company profits.

ARMY ENGINEERS NOT ALONE TO BLAME.

Let me repeat what has often been stated before, that army engineers are not to blame for the situation, although following Washington bureaucratic custom they are constantly reaching out for more power.

We put them where they are. We pretend to use them as a buffer to withstand congressional influence, and then when they miserably fail we pretend not to see their shortcomings.

From the day he first learns to discriminate between hay foot, straw foot, down to the day when inducted into the Chief Engineer's office; the officer has been taught obedience to superiors, acknowledgment of authority, and the surrender of his judgment to those above him. From the day he enters the military school to the day he completes his military career the officer ordinarily has no large financial responsibility nor source of income other than a meager salary compared with those with whom he associates in official and business life. Honorable, unquestionably. As a class we may concede these honor men resist temptation that might naturally cause the fall of others, but that is not the question involved. Called upon to handle many millions of dollars annually in contracts, without any supervision or limitation of those contracts; recommending millions annually for waterway projects without having had practical business training; confronted with the fact that political authority is exercised by men in high political positions, by those who may reward or destroy—besieged, importuned, and denounced in turn by those who have projects at stake—these engineers are assumed by us to be supermen. We place them in unenviable positions of trust and then seek to break down the barrier we have assumed to create against our own selfishness. We indulge in sophistry in an effort to deceive ourselves. Well-knowing engineers constantly yield to such influences, as evidenced by the Cumberland River, Lookout Harbor, Muscle Shoals, Missouri River, and scores of other questionable projects, we yet point to them as proof against influence and men qualified to handle some of the most responsible affairs of government.

What a legislative travesty and what a hypocritical proposition with which we seek to deceive ourselves.

Where public interest conflicts with private interest every man is expected to be absolutely independent and unbiased, but we know he is not nor will he ever be while human nature exists. Unlimited authority must cease and political pressure be withdrawn before the annual river and harbor bill will command respect.

A FEW QUESTIONABLE 1916 APPROPRIATIONS.

Need any further testimony of present autocratic methods of Army engineers be offered than that already presented?

We do not need alone to look with suspicion upon a \$250,000 appropriation in the 1916 bill for the Trinity River recommended by Army engineers or to be reminded that this is a stream on which about \$2,000,000 has been expended, and yet after 30 years' improvement the official report says, "There is little or no commerce on Trinity River above mile 6."

Nor do we wonder that Army engineers once proposed to float commerce on this river by using artesian wells?

Take the Brazos, which receives \$390,000 in the 1916 bill on the advice of engineers. A stream that after many years of "improvement" and an expenditure of \$1,776,000, reports on the upper river "there can be no commerce until completed" and on the lower river "no commerce statistics from one boat that makes weekly trips."

Generous with Government funds, our engineers recommend, and we find in the 1916 bill an item of \$499,000 for the Ouichita in Arkansas. After appropriating \$3,722,869 for this stream we find the present project is only 46 per cent completed, and, deducting timber, sand, and gravel, the commerce reported for 1914 was less than 27,000 tons.

Similar history accompanies the Red, which boasts of less than 2,000 tons of real commerce annually, and of the Arkansas, which gets \$209,000 in this bill, although it has been recommended for abandonment by Army engineers.

After getting us in deep they sometimes try unsuccessfully to get us out. Needless to say, once in it is hard to get out.

Let us not forget \$98,000, a small amount comparatively, given to the Coosa on the advice of engineers. An expenditure

of \$1,384,661, we find has been made, but on Chicken Shoal only 20 per cent is completed, and open-channel work is about 30 per cent completed on a river improvement first began in 1876. What can we hope for on learning that real commerce, deducting wood and timber, reaches less than 18,000 tons for 1914, and to read on page 749 of the 1915 report—

The decrease from last year is probably permanent. Only one boat is operating on this improvement, and that is not proving a paying investment.

The Cumberland gets \$710,000 in this bill on the advice of Army engineers in addition to \$5,773,000 already appropriated, although it has been repeatedly demonstrated that, deducting floatable wood and timber and also sand, the actual traffic reached only about 53,000 tons in 1914.

Take the Tennessee, which gets \$944,000 in this bill on the recommendation of Army engineers after some \$11,000,000 has been appropriated for the same river. Again it has been demonstrated that, deducting sand, gravel, and floatable timber, which does not require any large depth of water over that enjoyed 50 years ago, the actual traffic in 1914 on the river reached about 186,000 tons, of which ore and marble hauled from 5 to 15 miles, according to official reports, amounted to 78,000 tons.

Even the upper Mississippi, after deducting Government brush, sand, gravel, and floatable timber, reaches about the same as the Tennessee, as I have repeatedly demonstrated from an analysis of commerce statistics, and yet that upper river gets \$1,200,000 in this 1916 bill on the recommendation of Army engineers.

On 58 projects in the Mississippi Valley, it has been proposed by an engineer of acknowledged standing that we stop in this mad race to spend money irrespective of returns.

ALL WATERWAY AUTHORITIES ADVISE A HALT IN WASTE.

I can do no better than quote the words of Col. C. McD. Townsend at this time, with the further statement that Col. Townsend is chairman of the Mississippi River Commission and the best-informed Army engineer in the country on Mississippi River Valley waterways. He says:

Specifically the writer would not abandon any navigable stream in the Mississippi Valley that has been partially improved, but would leave 58 of them in their statu quo, confining operations to snagging and maintenance of existing works. * * * If facilities afforded by the Government are utilized (greater improvement of the Ohio and lower Mississippi), the upper Mississippi and the Missouri should then receive attention.

This was the admonition of Col. Townsend at the beginning of the present session last December, and his words inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 10 last bring a tremendous responsibility to Army engineers and legislators who ignore his advice at this time and are urging unlimited extravagance on useless projects.

CANALIZED RIVERS AND CANALS OF LITTLE VALUE.

Since 1873 Mr. CANNON has been a Member of this body. Honored for many years by the highest office in the gift of his associates, his knowledge of legislation and legislative methods is second to none. His judgment of results is based upon that knowledge. No legislator in Congress is better qualified to speak. Discussing the inland-waterway travesty which carries \$1,000,000 in the 1916 bill for the Beaufort and Norfolk worthless canal project, Mr. CANNON said, on April 4, during this debate:

Mr. Chairman, I have a very clear recollection of the desire of Indiana and Illinois for canals many years ago. * * * The canal passed through the neighborhood where I lived. * * * In round numbers, for canals Indiana expended about \$15,000,000. It took a long time to pay it. Illinois accumulated a debt not so large, but I think from eight to ten million dollars for the Illinois and Michigan Canal. * * * The Hennepin Canal. That was completed at a cost of nearly \$12,000,000, to the best of my recollection. * * * If any canal boat has ever carried a ton of freight over that canal from that time to this, I am not informed of it. * * * It was money thrown away.

Waterway authorities have given careful investigation to conditions surrounding canalized rivers and canals. Generally speaking, they agree that conditions are similar and neither will be of any especial permanent value for commercial purposes because of the new order of things and improved methods of transportation.

In "Waterways against Railways," Prof. Moulton gives his judgment, after an exhaustive study of waterways in Europe and this country, as follows:

We have found from our study that everywhere in Europe no less than in the United States there has occurred with the development of the railways a rapid decline in the amount of traffic carried on inland waterways. * * * To attempt now to return to the antiquated system of transportation of a half century ago * * * is to attempt to turn backward the clock of time.

OTHER WATERWAY AUTHORITIES.

Ex-Waterway Commissioner Reid, of Wisconsin, a practical riverman of many years' experience, made two extended trips to Europe at his own expense. During his investigations he traveled over the Rhine, the Danube, and Volga and studied the waterways of Europe as he had previously studied those of this country. His observations are summed up in a brief statement taken from my minority report, No. 254, part 2, Sixty-fourth Congress:

Our river traffic has rapidly declined. European Governments prevent railways from maintaining direct competition and foreign barge-men are content with a few cents a day for their service. Conditions here are far more difficult to overcome, and a return to practical inland river transportation is possible only with radically changed conditions, not affected by expensive river improvements.

Ex-Senator Burton was selected by Congress as chairman of the National Waterway Commission. He, too, gave a very careful investigation of European waterways in addition to those in this country with which he was already familiar. In Congress prior to leaving the Senate he gave a careful review of many wasteful projects we are engaged in "improving." Speaking of the Missouri River, typical of others, on which \$20,000,000 had already been expended, he said:

You may spend \$20,000,000—yes, \$30,000,000—on this project, and in spite of that enormous amount, the traffic will diminish, because you are facing a condition that no policy of river improvement can reverse—the loss of that class of river traffic and the utilization of other agencies for the carrying of freight. I wish it were not so. * * * but I am tired of rainbow chasing, and that is what this is. It is much worse than rainbow chasing. It is pure, bald, unmitigated waste.

FACTS SUSTAIN THESE AUTHORITIES.

I could quote from other authorities that have made an impartial study of the waterway question, but no man of national standing has arisen to dispute the deductions of such men. No man can successfully do so, because he is confronted with the proposition that after appropriating \$850,000,000 for American waterways, over \$800,000,000 of which has been expended and approximately one-half of which has gone into rivers, creeks, and canals, practically not one river or canal, apart from deep waterways, has proven a success commercially. The Ohio and Monongahela, by reason of coal deposits at their headwaters, have preserved a semblance of their commerce, but the Mississippi has lost approximately 90 per cent of its commerce while we have been expending \$150,000,000 on that river. The Missouri has become practically deserted, after an expenditure of over \$20,000,000. The Ohio has not held its own, after an expenditure of over \$50,000,000. The Tennessee has lost most of its river trade of 50 years ago, although \$11,000,000, in round numbers, has been appropriated for locks and dams and other improvements.

So the list could be continued indefinitely to include the Warrior, Alabama, Coosa, Cumberland, Trinity, Brazos, Arkansas, Ouichita, Red, and other rivers and canals.

We are wasting money on aimless ventures and are making no effort to get any economic or scientific understanding of the waterway question, depending entirely on local insistence in determining the appropriations we distribute.

We may spend another \$400,000,000 on rivers, creeks, and canals without any substantial increase in actual commerce, judging from past experience. We are taking over many new projects, and the game of draining the Federal Treasury goes merrily on, but no results are accomplished by this enormous expenditure of money, nor can we hope for any tangible returns.

Army engineers furnish misleading commercial reports of rivers and canals as a basis for future appropriations. After deducting sand, gravel, Government construction material, logs, and timber float on a small depth, the net commerce, aided by expensive improvements, is ordinarily slight and of little value compared with money spent.

I have repeatedly analyzed such reports, and the objectionable policy of placing projects all over the country in order to get the bill through has been regularly denounced by many Members. It is indefensible, and no substantial improvement will be reached until we reform our system, or lack of system.

Let me submit several tables that have been prepared. The showing of net tonnage on several rivers has been disputed in some instances, but, counting duplications and quadruplications, it gives a fair demonstration of the loss of actual commerce on rivers and canals all over the country. In proportion to appropriations the meager returns speak for themselves.

WHERE THE MONEY GOES.

In order to present the destination of waterway appropriations in concrete form it may be stated that two substitute bills reaching \$20,000,000 and \$30,000,000 were passed during the Sixty-third Congress in lieu of two bills aggregating \$92,000,000 which were defeated.

The \$50,000,000 was by law turned over to Army engineers for allotment, and out of 240 projects given specific amounts the following was awarded to an even dozen waterway projects:

Engineers' allotment, 1914 and 1915, of \$47,586,000, and 1916 bill.

Rivers.	1914, twenty million.	1915, thirty million.	Total Sixty-fourth Congress.	1916, proposed bill, \$39,608,410.
Mississippi.....	\$5,250,000	\$5,815,000	\$11,065,000	\$8,320,000
Missouri.....	950,000	1,100,000	2,050,000	1,750,000
Ohio ¹	1,769,000	3,915,000	5,684,000	5,509,000
Tennessee.....	223,000	501,000	724,000	944,000
Cumberland.....	210,000	378,000	588,000	710,000
Ouachita.....	300,000	136,000	436,000	499,000
Aransas Pass.....	470,000	180,000	650,000	100,000
Sabine Pass.....	240,000	100,000	340,000	590,000
Brazos.....	230,000	240,000	470,000	390,000
Black Warrior.....	708,000	48,000	816,000
Cape Fear.....	185,000	323,000	508,000	218,500
Beaufort Canal.....	400,000	400,000	1,000,000
Total.....	10,595,000	13,136,000	23,731,000	20,030,500

¹ The Ohio River was also given \$3,200,000 in the 1915 sundry civil bill.

Of two hundred and twenty-odd projects given the remaining 50 per cent from the 1914 and 1915 allotments about one-half were trafficless rivers which have a combined actual commerce less than the waterway tonnage of Buffalo or Boston or Cleveland or Philadelphia, or several other lake and ocean harbors. The 12 rivers that received \$23,731,000 in 1914 and 1915, or 50 per cent of the total during the Sixty-third Congress, are well recognized by the committee in the 1916 bill with an aggregate of \$20,030,500 out of \$39,358,410 contained in the bill after deducting \$250,000 for surveys.

The 1916 bill from which the minority dissents gives these same 12 river projects nearly as much as was allotted for the two years 1914 and 1915. More striking, one-half of the entire proposed 1916 appropriation goes to these 12 river projects. Deducting \$20,030,500 above provided and \$250,000 for new surveys leaves \$19,327,910, which is divided among the remaining 270 items. Of these items approximately 170 are canals, bayous, and rivers all of which do not handle as much actual commerce as two or three harbors than can be named.

Over \$250,000,000 has been spent on the 12 river and canal projects by the Government in an effort to resuscitate a lost commerce. Deducting floatable timber and sand that floated a half century ago in larger quantities than to-day and do not require expensive waterways, several of these projects are reported to have floated in 1913 approximately as follows:

Upper Mississippi (average upper Mississippi haul less than 50 miles, or less than 30,000 tons average continuous haul)	Tons.
Lower Mississippi (excluding coal)	170,000
Ohio (95 per cent coal) under	2,000,000
Tennessee (includes on Tennessee 78,000 tons coal hauled 16 miles)	200,000
Tombigbee and Warrior (includes on Warrior 32,000 tons coal, distance not stated, average)	58,000
Beaufort Canal	65,000
Cumberland	53,000
Missouri	24,000
Hennepin Canal	11,850
Muscle Shoals Canal	5,887
Red River	1,694

Aside from soft coal, as near as can be estimated, the average haul was from 30 to 100 miles on the various rivers.

THE ABOVE RIVERS RECEIVED 50 PER CENT OF EVERY BILL.

During 1914, 1915, and 1916 approximately one-half of the entire amount given to all waterways was for these 10 river and canal projects. The balance was divided among about 270 or more projects, of which 20 genuine waterways disclosed 1913 traffic as follows:

10 ocean harbors.	Tons.	10 lake harbors.	Tons.
New York (estimated).....	100,000,000	Superior-Duluth.....	46,875,000
Philadelphia.....	26,267,335	Chicago-Calumet.....	13,275,000
Boston (estimated).....	20,000,000	Milwaukee.....	8,647,000
Baltimore.....	14,781,942	Ashland.....	5,623,309
Norfolk.....	17,349,942	Ashabula.....	15,743,375
Savannah.....	3,154,089	Cleveland.....	16,488,083
New Orleans.....	6,442,932	Buffalo.....	18,920,854
Galveston.....	4,445,088	Erie.....	3,340,071
San Francisco.....	9,353,530	Marquette.....	1,832,229
Portland, Ore.....	7,923,902	Soo Canal.....	79,714,344

Approximately 200,000,000 tons of waterway commerce was handled at the 10 ocean ports, and, allowing for duplications, one-half that amount at the 10 lake ports. Presumably the commerce was carried on the average 200 to 500 miles, counting ocean and lake traffic, but, like some other waterway statistics, no definite figures are available.

The significance of the comparisons will not be overlooked. Ten ocean ports handled fifty times the actual commerce carried on 10 river projects that annually receive about half of the average waterway bill, and these same rivers floated only about 4 per cent of the commerce counted at 10 lake ports.

COST TO THE GOVERNMENT FOR FLOATING "COMMERCE."

The cost to the Government for furnishing a waterway for inland commerce per ton is not definitely settled as to method of computation and only approximate results can be reached, because the amount properly chargeable to investment interest is variously estimated, although annual maintenance is sure and certain. Excluding floatable timber and sand, usually hauled short distances, the following estimates have been made on the several rivers and canals noted:

	Per ton.
Ohio River (excluding coal, \$40 per ton).....	\$3.00
Ouachita.....	8.00
Warrior and Tombigbee.....	12.00
Upper Mississippi.....	12.00
Lower Mississippi.....	35.00
Arkansas.....	20.00
Hennepin.....	36.75
Missouri.....	40.00
Muscle Shoals (Tennessee).....	40.00
Aransas Pass Canal.....	80.00
Brazos.....	80.00
Red.....	100.00
Muscle Shoals (proposed).....	150.00
Big Sandy, Ky.....	350.00

It is interesting to note that in round numbers the following estimate of expenditures per mile have been made by the Government on three waterways:

	Per mile.
Lower Mississippi, 1,000 miles, at.....	\$100,000
Ohio River to Missouri River, 200 miles, at.....	86,000
Upper Mississippi, 600 miles, at.....	40,000
Ohio River, 1,000 miles, at.....	60,000
Lower Missouri, 400 miles, at.....	40,000

Government and State canal investments are proportionately wasteful.

	Per mile.
Hennepin Canal, 60 miles, at.....	\$126,000
Muscle Shoals, 26 miles, at.....	175,000
Muscle Shoals, proposed, 26 miles, at.....	560,000
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, proposed, 13 miles, at.....	1,530,000

The above river and canal projects are small waterways that float an insignificant commerce compared with the investment. Can any condemnation of our wasteful purposeless waterway policy compare with a brief statement of expenditures past, present, and prospective.

CHANGE THE SYSTEM.

Mr. Chairman, I believe no permanent improvement in river and harbor legislation will be brought about until the whole system is changed. It is hard to conceive of any more unsatisfactory procedure than the present method of securing waterway legislation.

No one factor is alone responsible for conditions. Enthusiastic waterway conventions urge particular projects. In the case of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress a permanent organized lobby keeps pressing on Congress a policy of appropriating \$50,000,000 annually for "a policy not a project."

If we would get away from present conditions and inaugurate a scientific and economic waterway system fashioned on the plan adopted by European Governments we must take the matter out of politics.

Never in recent history has the time been more opportune for a change, and with the hope that a suggestion may bear fruit by pointing the way toward a businesslike method of handling the question I submit herewith a bill I have introduced proposing a national waterway commission.

A bill (H. R. 6821) creating a national waterway commission.

Be it enacted, etc., That a commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the national waterway commission, hereafter referred to as the commission, which shall be composed of five commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the commissioners shall be members of the same political party. The first commissioners appointed shall continue in office for terms of three, four, five, six, and seven years, respectively, from the date of the taking effect of this act the term of each to be designated by the President, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of seven years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the commissioner whom he shall succeed. The commission shall choose a chairman from its own membership. No commissioner shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. Any commissioner may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. A vacancy in the commission shall not impair the right of the remaining commissioners to exercise all the powers of the commission.

SEC. 2. That each commissioner shall receive an annual salary of \$10,000, payable in the same manner as the judges of the courts of the United States. The commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive an annual salary of \$5,000, payable in like manner. The commission shall have the authority to employ and fix the compensation of civil engineers, clerks, and other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties and as may be

from time to time appropriated by Congress, and in making appointments for continuous service the commission, so far as practicable, shall select its employees from the classified service.

All property of the United States in the hands or under the control of Army engineers or other officials or of private individuals or public contractors, including dredges, steamboats, barges, yards, and other property used in the improvement of public waterways, shall be placed under the jurisdiction and authority of the commission.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of War may, if practicable, detail such Army engineers as are requested by the commission to assist in organizing and establishing a comprehensive system of waterway improvement, providing that such details of engineers shall not be made to the detriment of their military duties.

SEC. 4. That the commission shall have the authority and it shall be its duty to make an investigation of all waterway projects now constructed in whole or in part by Federal aid. The commission shall prepare a complete and succinct statement, by years, of the amount heretofore appropriated for each project, the estimated amount required to complete such project, a report of the commerce now served and to be served, the character of such commerce given by separate items so far as can be furnished, the source of information, the interests to be served, the kind of water craft used, and such other information as may be useful in determining the public use and value of the project. The commission shall also furnish Congress, at the earliest practicable date, information concerning all harbors and waterways now improved or being improved in whole or in part by Government aid, showing the amount of commerce, character of terminals or landings, ownership thereof, and, so far as practicable, ownership of regular lines of craft used thereon; and the commission shall also report its recommendations for the finishing of the projects now being constructed or modification of existing plans or abandonment of work on any project, together with findings upon which such recommendations are based.

The commission shall further ascertain and report what projects are now being improved for purposes other than navigation, and if for power development, a full statement of interests concerned, officers and stockholders, public use to be served, if any, private or public contribution toward expense of construction, and the commission's recommendations thereon. Said commission shall further ascertain and report what projects are now being carried on in whole or in part for land-reclamation purposes, the character of such project, amount of lands to be recovered, estimated value of such lands, ownership thereof, and contributions now being made by beneficiaries toward such expenditures, together with the commission's recommendations.

The commission shall make a full investigation into all work now being performed by the Mississippi River Commission, the amount of money heretofore expended on such river, character and permanency of work performed, and reclamation interests now being served, if there be any, a full statement of contributions by public or private interests toward said work, together with a comprehensive and intelligible report of the probable cost of the present plans of levee construction or other river improvement now being undertaken, the percentage of project completed, and this commission's recommendation thereon. Such Mississippi River report shall be separate and distinct from reports on other projects now under improvement by the Federal Government.

All of such data and all other available information of a pertinent character affecting particular projects or entire waterway improvements now being conducted by the Federal Government shall be collected in convenient form and presented to Congress in installments at the earliest practicable date.

When the commission shall have reason to believe at any time that the proposed project is not for general use of the public or will not warrant further expenditures, or if contributions shall be required to be furnished before further appropriations are made or further expenditures authorized, such commission shall immediately report to Congress, with a preliminary recommendation thereon, and shall furnish a copy thereof to the United States Treasurer. That thereupon, when so recommended, the Treasurer shall withhold all funds theretofore appropriated not specifically obligated under existing contracts and shall refuse further payments until subsequent and specific action shall be had thereon by Congress.

SEC. 5. That prior to the presentation of any new waterway-project appropriations the commission shall cause a careful survey of the proposed improvement, and if it shall appear such project is to serve a public use and is feasible, the commission shall thereupon collate data showing the estimated cost thereof, commerce to be served, water craft to be used, public terminals furnished, and contributions recommended to be made by public or private interests, together with such additional data as has heretofore been specifically required to be furnished on existing projects. The commission shall thereupon transmit to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a full report concerning such new project or projects, its recommendations thereon, and, if requested so to do, all other and further information that may be required by the Committee on Appropriations.

Whenever the commission shall determine that any waterway project is primarily for power or land-reclamation purposes or to serve special interests, the commission may recommend Government aid for such project, notwithstanding the special interests to be served, and shall prepare data showing the proportionate amount of Federal aid recommended, together with suitable restrictions as to audit and payment of funds from the Public Treasury. Such recommendation shall be presented as a proposed separate bill to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and shall not be embodied in any general waterway appropriation bill by such committee.

Whenever any new survey shall be proposed for any waterway project, the commission, prior to such survey, may require data to be furnished showing the public use and prospective commerce to be served and such other information as may be desired, and a brief synopsis of such information shall be furnished to Congress by the commission to accompany any recommendations made for new surveys.

All existing waterways, new projects, and new surveys shall be classified, so far as practicable, prior to each regular session of Congress, together with estimates of appropriations required for maintenance and improvement for the ensuing two-year period, and a brief report as to each project considered shall be separately prepared and, with the commission's recommendation thereon, shall be placed in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations of the House at the beginning of each session.

Whenever the Appropriations Committee so requires the commission shall furnish additional data concerning any project, and shall further aid the Committee on Appropriations when requested so to do in the preparation of the regular river and harbor bill, which shall be prepared and presented by the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

The commission shall further compile and cause to be published at the earliest practicable date for the use of Congress an intelligent, concise

statement of past waterway expenditures by the Government and of amounts needed to complete all continuing projects, and shall further give estimates of future obligations to be incurred by new projects recommended for construction. The commission shall give preference in its recommendations to Congress of appropriations needed to complete the more important projects, and, so far as practicable, shall enter upon a program looking toward the early completion of such projects.

The commission shall make a thorough investigation of reasons for loss of river traffic and shall make recommendations for the reestablishment of such traffic. It shall ascertain and determine the most available craft for river use, and, as soon as practicable, shall prepare plans and build experimental craft for such purpose.

Whenever reason therefor shall appear the commission may fix reasonable freight rates on all interstate water-borne traffic by common carrier and upon all such traffic on navigable waters wholly within the State, subject, however, to the jurisdiction now conferred by law on the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix maximum joint rates between and over rail and water lines.

The commission shall determine the reasonableness of wharfage or water-terminal charges, whether such terminals are owned by private persons or municipalities, and all river and harbor improvements, including terminal facilities, shall be under the supervision and control of the commission.

Whenever the commission shall determine that unprofitable railway freight tariffs are maintained in any given case in order to prevent waterway competition, it shall be the duty of the commission to make a report thereon in duplicate to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to Congress, with recommendations that Congress give power, if need be, to the Interstate Commerce Commission for fixing minimum railway rates.

The commission shall at the earliest practicable date adopt an intelligent system of national waterway improvement and shall perform such other and further duties as may present themselves from time to time.

Whenever it shall be desirable to secure sworn testimony from any witness or witnesses relating to any project or to navigation generally, or whenever the commission shall have reason to believe that private interests are secretly or improperly seeking to influence the commission or to force the passage of any private or public waterway measure through Congress the commission may cause a hearing or summary investigation to be held, and for that purpose may issue subpoenas, subpoenas, or other writs in the same manner and under the same procedure as is more specifically set forth in the act to regulate commerce approved February 4, 1887, and the amendments thereto, which portions of such act relating to procedure, so far as applicable, are made a part of this act, and may bring before such commission all parties believed to be informed concerning the facts or interested in the passage of such measure. A complete record shall be preserved of the testimony taken at such hearing and a certified transcript thereof shall be transmitted immediately to the Committee on Appropriations.

SEC. 6. That all unexpended balances to the credit of any project not specifically obligated under existing contracts shall, from the date of the passage of this act, be transferred by the Treasurer to the general fund, and all vouchers thereafter paid by the Treasurer shall be upon order of the national waterway commission.

SEC. 7. That the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury, to carry out the provisions of this act.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I submitted to the chairman of the subcommittee on surveys to be inserted at this point, and I will ask him to send it to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS: Page 35, after line 1, insert as a new paragraph:

"Shore front from Jones Inlet to Rockaway Inlet, with a view to obtaining data as to tide, current, drift, and depth of water, with a view to determining whether or not the interests of navigation are being endangered by the erosion thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waterway or ship channel along the most practicable route between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario of sufficient capacity to admit the largest vessels now in use on the Great Lakes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I do not know that I shall make the point of order. There are several items in this bill for canals that may be properly in the bill or may not be properly in the bill. What is intended to be accomplished by this project with reference to a waterway around Niagara Falls? I refer to this ship canal between Lakes Erie and Ontario. What is the proposition?

Mr. BURGESS. Just what it says.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, it does not say anything. You might build it around by the North Pole for all I know. What is the proposition?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will say that so far as I know the purpose is to get an estimate upon a canal leaving Lake Erie some little distance above the Niagara River and running across to Lake Ontario on what I would call the east side of the river; that is, on the American side.

Mr. MANN. That runs around south of the city of Buffalo?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is on American soil. It is to run to the right, as you look down the river.

Mr. MANN. Where is this canal expected to start from, above or below the city of Buffalo?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is to be determined, of course, by the engineers, if they should report favorably upon a project.

Mr. MANN. I understand that, but I assume that the committee does not stick items like this in a bill without some idea of what they are. Are items of this sort put in the bill just because some one somewhere has had a bad dream and asked to have them put in?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. I assumed not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. One of the gentlemen from New York presented this survey to me, and it went then to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BURGESS. It is to start at some point below Buffalo. I have forgotten just now the point; but perhaps the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT] can state.

Mr. MANN. Is not this something that would be very expensive? I refer now to the survey.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think not.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, after line 7, insert the following:

"Buffalo Harbor, Buffalo Creek, and Buffalo Ship Canal, N. Y., with a view to increasing the dimensions thereof to meet the demands of present and prospective commerce."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, what is the proposition with this survey? Is this to carry out the idea of the Welland Canal or is it in conjunction with the Erie Canal?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I will state for the benefit of the gentleman that this provision has nothing to do with the proposed ship canal or the barge canal to extend from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario. That is the proposition submitted by a colleague of mine, and I think his idea was to construct a canal or a channel to compete with the Canadian Channel at the Welland Canal that is now being completed at the expenditure of a great deal of money.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain what his proposition is in the amendment just now submitted?

Mr. DRISCOLL. For a great many years at Buffalo, or at the harbor of Buffalo, conditions have been congested, especially in the outer harbor. From the outer harbor to the fork, probably a distance of 500 feet, a narrow-neck channel, the space is less than 200 feet.

That channel is obstructed by a line of boats that generally anchor along what is known as the Delaware trestle. Leading from there up into Buffalo Creek or the Buffalo Ship Canal, on account of the great increase in commerce coming up through the concrete locks, we feel that a general survey would be very beneficial not only to the port of Buffalo but to every State bordering upon the Great Lakes; and that is our reason for asking for this survey.

Mr. STAFFORD. And this is no canalization scheme?

Mr. DRISCOLL. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Merely an inner-harbor proposition?

Mr. DRISCOLL. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Overpeck Creek, N. J., from Little Ferry to Leonia.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has brought into this House H. R. 12193, designated as a bill making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

For more than a week past this bill has been under consideration. Numerous and various amendments have been offered to certain of its provisions by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], and others, and nearly all of these amendments have been turned down by the House.

The consideration of this bill from day to day has been especially interesting. Many heated discussions have been had upon the merits and demerits of certain provisions of the bill. I have taken no part in the discussion, but I have listened attentively to the persuasive arguments offered, both for and against numerous provisions of the bill. I have also carefully read each and every item in this bill, and have read many portions of the hearings, and to one who is serving his first term in this House I confess the recommendation for the appropriations provided for

in this bill are astounding, to say the least of them. So much so, if you please, as to constrain me, in order that I might vote intelligently on the various amendments that have been offered or may hereafter be offered, and that I might be able to vote either for or against this bill when it comes up for final passage, to make some investigation with reference to the appropriations heretofore made by Congress in relation to the subject matter of the bill.

The first appropriation for rivers was made by Congress on the 6th of April, 1802, in the sum of \$30,000, and each and every year since that time Congress has appropriated various sums of money for the improvement and protection of rivers, canals, and harbors.

The report of the Secretary of War, Lindley M. Garrison, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on January 12, 1915, shows that Congress has appropriated from year to year, commencing with the first appropriation on the 6th of April, 1802, to certain States and Territories for the protection, preservation, and maintenance of their rivers, canals, and harbors the following sums of money, to wit:

Alabama	\$9,115,230.60
Alaska	513,500.00
Arkansas	1,871,501.05
California	21,672,604.10
Connecticut	6,799,123.81
Delaware	2,560,449.49
Florida	17,536,579.88
Georgia	15,388,219.57
Hawaii	3,058,500.00
Idaho	37,705.59
Illinois	19,874,736.72
Indiana	2,461,839.92
Iowa	2,500.00
Kansas	25,000.00
Kentucky	9,568,585.70
Louisiana	5,296,829.57
Maine	7,399,565.99
Marina Islands	10,000.00
Maryland	10,836,445.50
Massachusetts	21,410,898.91
Michigan	59,378,884.50
Minnesota	1,699,238.20
Mississippi	5,848,490.95
Missouri	224,000.00
Montana	14,750.00
New Hampshire	1,719,471.00
New Jersey	7,311,272.71
New York	57,161,356.20
North Carolina	11,190,257.92
Ohio	22,423,769.53
Oregon	5,816,879.55
Pennsylvania	5,082,468.73
Porto Rico	785,500.00
Rhode Island	8,134,002.82
South Carolina	10,600,536.64
Tennessee	356,853.00
Texas	40,135,890.38
Vermont	983,085.20
Virginia	10,797,518.58
Washington	9,394,332.00
West Virginia	6,559,965.42
Wisconsin	16,484,000.05

Now, it seems to me that it has been the policy of Congress for many years to make appropriations for the protection and maintenance of rivers, canals, and harbors of the United States. These annual appropriations have been made from the beginning of the Government down to the present time. Besides these enormous appropriations which have been made by Congress from year to year, additional miscellaneous appropriations have been made aggregating \$409,947,557.97. These various appropriations reach the grand total of \$850,551,708.25.

Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder that there is a deficit in the United States Treasury at the end of this fiscal year of \$50,097,315? Is it not more the wonder that this Government has escaped bankruptcy?

I am frank to admit that the great national harbors of the Atlantic and Pacific and of the Great Lakes should be protected and maintained. The appropriations heretofore made, year after year, with reference to these harbors have been entirely appropriate and in the interest of the people of this Nation and of this Government. Now, it is proposed by this bill to appropriate this year the sum of \$39,608,410 for the various projects enumerated in the present rivers and harbors bill. Of course, there can be no question but what there are many meritorious projects set forth in the present bill, and I again most heartily support this bill to that extent. There are, however, many unmeritorious projects provided for in the bill which require the expenditure of several millions of dollars, and which, in my judgment, is entirely unnecessary.

I feel that it is the part of gross extravagance to spend about twenty millions of dollars on inland rivers, canals, and lakes that are of but little importance to the people of this Nation. They are, no doubt, of great interest to the inhabitants of the various States, and the States in which these rivers are located

should make provision for their repair and maintenance. I do not feel that these small rivers, lakes, and harbors should be provided for in a national way or by an appropriation from the National Treasury on the part of Congress.

I know that those in favor of this bill will say to us that we do not understand the situation and location of these various small rivers, canals, and harbors; that we are not advised with reference to the needs of the people who use these rivers and harbors; and that consequently we ought not to make any objection to this lavish expenditure. I further clearly understand that new Members of Congress are presumed to be seen and not heard; that the older Members of Congress, who have had years of experience with this appropriation, are well advised with reference to the merits of the same, and that new Congressmen should follow the advice and counsel of their seniors in Congress with reference to appropriations. I can not subscribe to this theory. I want to vote for this bill because of the several meritorious projects contained therein, but I feel that the bill should be pruned and shorn of a great many of the immaterial projects that it contains. This is an omnibus bill, so framed as to embarrass Members who would like to support its meritorious provisions, but who can not do so without supporting unmeritorious provisions contained in it.

ECONOMY.

Both the Republican and Democratic Parties have declared in their numerous platforms in years gone by for economy. The Democratic Party in its platform of 1912 declared in part as follows:

We favor the adoption of a liberal and comprehensive plan for the development and improvement of our inland waterways with economy and efficiency so as to permit their navigation by vessels of standard draft.

The Republican Party in its platform of 1912 provided in part as follows:

The Mississippi River is the Nation's drainage ditch. Its flood waters, gathered from 31 States and the Dominion of Canada, constitute an overpowering force which breaks the levees and pours its torrents over many millions of acres of the richest land in the Union; stops the mails, impedes commerce, and causes great loss of life and property. These floods are national in scope and the disasters they produce seriously affect the general welfare. The States unaided can not cope with this giant problem, hence, we believe the Federal Government ought to assume a fair proportion of the burden of its control so as to prevent the disasters from recurring floods.

Now, it will be seen that the Democratic Party in its platform proposes to deal with these appropriations in an economical way, and the Republican Party in its platform proposes to assume a fair proportion of the burden with reference to the protection and maintenance of the rivers in the Mississippi Valley.

I had hoped that many of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] and others would be adopted and to that end I supported the various amendments offered. However, I am convinced that it is the purpose and intention of a majority of the Membership of this House, regardless of their party affiliation, to pass this appropriation bill involving this great expenditure regardless of the consequences and without knowing where the money is to come from.

The appropriations by Congress have constantly increased since 1910, and the appropriations that must of necessity be made by this Congress will far surpass any that have been made in the history of the Government. Now, who is to bear the burden of raising the money? It is the taxpayer of the country. There can be no question but what this Congress must provide for these lavish appropriations through the enactment of an inheritance tax, an additional income tax, a tax on the shipment of manufactured war munitions, an additional tax on spirituous and malt liquors, and possibly an additional tax on corporations, automobiles, gasoline, oil, iron, and steel, and, in short, place a direct tax upon all the business interests of the country.

I do not claim to be familiar with all the facts surrounding these various projects, but the facts have been pretty thoroughly thrashed out on the floor of this House in the discussions had during the consideration of this bill, and there is a marked discrepancy in the conclusions reached with reference to the various provisions of the bill. This discrepancy has tended more to confuse than to enlighten. When you stop to think that we are about to spend nearly forty million dollars of the people's money, it seems to me that we ought to be certain that the expenditure of this amount of money is really necessary.

I do not mean to criticize the committee. This practice has gone on for so many years, and the various States have annually received their proportionate appropriation so regularly, that many of the members of the committee and of this House really and sincerely believe that this appropriation should be made, and that it is in the interest of the people of the Nation. I regret that Congress should have drifted into such a false posi-

tion. There are many distinguished Members on both sides of this House, men who have given these matters careful and long consideration, who fully believe that this appropriation is greatly in excess of what it should be. Besides, from present indications, these appropriations are to be made continuously from year to year, and no one knows when Congress will cease to make such appropriations. Some one has said to me that no appropriation bill is more carefully scrutinized by the Members of this House than the rivers and harbors appropriation bill. This may be true, but if this is a fair example of legislation in the interest of economy, then I confess that I do not understand the meaning of the term.

Congress has heretofore appropriated \$493,725 for the improvement, repair, and maintenance of the Ocmulgee River in Georgia, and the present Congress proposes to appropriate \$53,000 this year for the repair, improvement, and maintenance of the Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers in Georgia.

Congress has appropriated heretofore \$285,750 for work on the Oconee River in Georgia, and the sum of \$493,725 for work on Jekyl Creek in Georgia. Congress has appropriated \$1,728,154.24 for the protection and maintenance of the White River in Arkansas, and it is proposed to make an additional appropriation this year. For many years exceptions have been taken, both by Members of Congress and by the press of the country to these unmeritorious expenditures, and I have felt it to be my duty to give expression to my views with reference to this matter, so that the people of the district whom I have the honor to represent may know what has been done by Congress with reference to the appropriations provided for for the various projects in this bill.

The people of the Nation as a whole ought to know just what is going on in Congress with reference to the expenditure of public money. There seems to me to be considerable pork in this bill, and I hope the committee will consent to some of the amendments offered here so that I may be able to support the bill for the meritorious items which it contains. If the committee will eliminate the insignificant projects contained in this bill, for which large and extravagant appropriations are sought to be made, and clean up the bill and get rid of this pork, then I would be glad to vote for it. In fact, there are many Members here who would be glad to vote for it, but so long as the bill remains in its present form I do not see my way clear to vote for it. Why not take the pork out of it? Why waste public money in this reckless way? The Government needs the money, and needs it badly. I believe in economy in administering the affairs of the Nation, and I am unequivocally against such reckless and wholesale extravagance.

We are transacting business for the people, and we should protect the interests of those whom we represent. That is my sense of feeling in the matter, and I shall be governed accordingly.

The Clerk read as follows:

Channel connecting York River, Va., with Back Creek to Slaughter's Wharf, with a view to securing a depth of 10 feet and widths of 200 and 100 feet, respectively.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, after line 6, insert:

"Northwest River, Va. and N. C., with a view to its improvement from its mouth as far up as may be practicable."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Beach Creek, Va., with a view to increasing the dimensions of the channel to a depth of 6 feet and a width of 60 feet.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, after line 10, insert:

"Mattaponi River, Va., with a view to removing the bars and securing increased depth of water at the mouth."

"Queens Creek, Va., with a view to securing increased depth of water at the mouth."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Escambia River, Fla.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 23, insert:

"One Mile Creek.

"Bayou Manannota, Ala."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURGESS. I also offer the following amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, after line 23, insert:

"Key West Harbor, Fla., with a view to removing the middle ground. Onosohatchee River, Fla."

Mr. MANN. What is the proposition with reference to removing the "middle ground" at Key West?

Mr. SEARS. That is the name of it. It is known as the "middle ground." As I understand it, there is a mud bank in the harbor of Key West, and by removing same—and the expense will not be much—it will give approximately 26 feet of water, and a very much wider channel. One of the steamship companies going into Key West is now building a boat 440 feet long, for the purpose of handling the commerce at this harbor, and unless this "middle ground" is removed the same can not be done as the channel will not be wide enough. As a matter of fact, there should be an appropriation in this bill for the purpose of removing this "middle ground," and I am satisfied the same would have been included, in view of the importance of the harbor as a naval base, as well as from a commercial standpoint, if the committee had not unanimously decided not to include any new projects.

I trust there will be no opposition to this amendment.

Mr. MANN. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS: Page 37, line 23, insert "One Mile Creek and Bayou Marmotte, Ala."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bayous des Cannes and Nezpique, La.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, when the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, made his speech opening this debate, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] interrupted to say that the aggregate expenditures had been \$680,000,000. I rose, not knowing the facts concerning the total expenditure, and asked a question:

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I should like to ask one question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice in the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] made on January 13 that he made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker, we have paid out of the Government Treasury over \$850,000,000 for waterways."

Now, has \$850,000,000 been paid out of the Treasury in actual money?

I made that inquiry because I did not know. The gentleman from Florida answered:

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is not my understanding, and I have gone over the matter very closely. I think the error of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] arose from the fact that he was considering appropriations rather than expenditures.

Mr. FREAR. Unquestionably. Almost anyone would understand that by reading the speech as a whole. That was the intention.

Whereupon, the gentleman from Florida said:

But the gentleman called me to task awhile ago, and insisted that I was wrong when I used the word "expenditures."

Mr. Chairman, that speech covers 45 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I had not had time to read it very carefully, at least, not all of it. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That speech covers 45 pages, 90 columns solid. Not more than half of it was delivered on the floor of the House.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. SPARKMAN], referring to the gentleman [Mr. FREAR], interrupted and said:

But the gentleman called me to task awhile ago, and insisted that I was wrong when I used the word "expenditures."

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] had criticized the gentleman from Florida, the distinguished chairman of the committee, for having used the word "expenditures" wrongly; but when I asked the question to elicit information as to the sense in which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] himself had used the words "paid out of the Treasury," the gentleman replied that I ought to have understood that he meant "appropriated."

In reply to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] said:

I did not get the distinction the gentleman made at the time.

Then the colloquy continued as follows:

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think if the gentleman will look over his speech he will find that he did not make that distinction.

Mr. FREAR. No; I presume that was an error in expression. The chairman says the amount is \$800,000,000, but it is impossible to say what the exact expenditure has been since the last report.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman allow me to make one comment right there?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not think a gentleman should be obliged to read 40 or 50 pages of a speech to find out what it means, when a gentleman says that more than \$850,000,000 has been paid out of the Treasury. [Applause.]

As a matter of fact, less than \$800,000,000 had been paid out. The \$853,000,000 were all of the appropriations for waterways not since 1875, but since the beginning of the Government. Besides the \$54,000,000 expended previous to 1875 there was \$38,000,000 on hand on the 1st of January, 1916; so that the \$54,000,000 and the \$38,000,000, with their fractions, made more than \$93,000,000 of difference between the sum actually "paid out of the Treasury" since 1875 and the amount in the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. PLATT rose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not yield now. Of course, I would not even so much as intimate that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] intended to mislead the House. I did not attribute or think of attributing the slightest personal wrongful motive to the gentleman.

The gentleman says that I ought to have known who Prof. Moulton is. Will the gentleman kindly tell me in what institution the gentleman is a professor?

Mr. FREAR. Prof. Moulton is a professor in the University of Chicago, a man of acknowledged standing in the United States. The gentleman sitting at my right, the leader of the minority [Mr. MANN], knows him well, and I have heard him spoken of very highly by many people.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman said I did not know because of my ignorance.

Mr. FREAR. I withdraw that remark.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There are a great many people in the world of whom I have never heard. There are a great many people in the world who have never heard of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], but they are not therefore necessarily ignorant.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Not now.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman will find that there are others.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. A few days ago I consulted Who's Who in America to learn about Prof. Moulton, but his name was not in that very voluminous book. Strange as it may seem, it so happened that I never heard of him until I listened to the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin. Now, in this book of Prof. Moulton he says:

When this investigation was undertaken the writer shared in the common belief that traffic of certain kinds can be carried at substantially less cost by water than by rail.

He inclined to that view, he says, until he made a long investigation in Europe, which was financed by the famous clothing house of Hart, Schaffner & Marx. They gave him the money to go abroad, and Prof. J. Laurence Laughlin inspired the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more. This is important.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman has declared that Prof. Moulton is a great expert, and speaks of Mr. Reed as also a great expert. Now, Mr. Reed was a county probate judge in Wisconsin, as I have ascertained from people who knew. A few years ago the Legislature of Wisconsin passed a law providing for the appointment of a man to investigate waterways, and a county probate judge in La Crosse, was appointed, a man who used to be a resident of the city of Hudson, the home of the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. FEAR. He went to Europe and investigated and came back. Within a short time, three or four years, the legislature repealed the law, and he is out of office. He has been here in the gallery, so a gentleman who knows him tells me, much interested in this matter. He is opposed to the improvement of inland waterways in the United States, as anybody can see who reads his opinions on the subject.

Now, here is another book that was published by another professor in the Chicago University, entitled "Government Regulation of Railway Rates." It is by Prof. Hugo R. Meyer, and was published in 1905, just prior to the legislation to extend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission. He said:

This book presents the conclusions forced upon the author by a painstaking study of the railway question extending over some 12 years.

The net result has been the disclosure of such overwhelming proof of the evils of State direction of industry or interference with its natural course, that he has become firmly convinced of the unwisdom of Government regulation of railways or their rates.

Prof. Meyer was strongly against any Government regulation of railroad rates. He was convinced against his will about this, as Prof. Moulton, of the same institution, was convinced against his will on the subject of waterway improvements.

Further on he said:

The book appears at the present time because of the possibility that Congress, influenced by the discontent that exists in some sections of the country because of the friction necessarily incident to the transaction of the complicated business of transportation, may be led to an act of ill-considered laws granting dangerously enlarged power to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

A fair consideration of these facts and of the conditions under which railroads must operate to secure their greatest efficiency compels the conclusion that whatever evils now exist none of them are at all commensurate with the harm which must result from bestowing the power to fix railroad rates to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. CONRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CONRY. Is the university with which these distinguished professors are connected endowed by anybody?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CONRY. By whom?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. By John D. Rockefeller—a great man in the world of business, but not especially an enemy of railways.

Now, this book of Prof. Meyer was issued in 1905, just before the tremendous struggle came on in the House of Representatives over the Hepburn bill to grant more power to the Interstate Commerce Commission. In 1903 I had introduced a bill conferring power on the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate railroad rates, the first bill of that kind ever introduced by a Member from Wisconsin in either House of Congress. We know the tremendous struggle that went on here to force the legislation through the two Houses of Congress.

Prof. Moulton's book, published in 1912, financed by Hart, Schaffner & Marx and supervised by Prof. J. Laurence Laughlin, is an argument against—and I have looked it through carefully—against all waterway improvement unless it be some harbor where railroads have terminals. He is opposed to waterway improvement, as the other professor was opposed to railway-rate regulation. I do not recognize either him or Mr. Reed as an authority to whom I must always yield my judgment as to what is best for the industrial development of the country. On the title-page Mr. Moulton is not called a professor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Dr. Moulton is the son of Dr. W. J. Moulton, who was brought from Oxford, England, by President Harper when he opened the University of Chicago under the reorganization in 1893 or 1894, and this Dr. Moulton received his degree in the Chicago University.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What year?

Mr. FESS. I could not give the gentleman the exact year, but I think prior, of course, to the writing of that book.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The book was published in 1912.

Mr. FESS. Then, quite a time before that. The Dr. Moulton, whose book the gentleman has, was educated in the University of Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I say after careful examination of this book of Moulton's, so often cited by the gentleman from Wisconsin, that from cover to cover it is an elaborate argument against anything like the improvement of rivers in the United States for transportation purposes, and that Prof. Moulton is just as strongly opposed to such improvements as the other professor—Prof. Meyer—was opposed to Government regulation of railway rates.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12193, the river and harbor appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee for one week, on account of death in family.

To Mr. HILL for this week, on account of illness.

To Mr. FARR for three days, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. MOONEY for one week, on account of illness in family.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I report back to the House the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill. (H. Rept. 514.)

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Arizona any suggestion to make in reference to it?

Mr. MANN. It goes to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. It will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the middle ground in Key West Harbor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 11, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7093) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stewart, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and a memorial were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 14418) to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to procure postal cars and contract for hauling them, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 14419) authorizing the Secretary of War to have made an appropriate investigation of the Washita and other rivers in southeastern Oklahoma; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 14420) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Perryville, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,

Also, a bill (H. R. 14421) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Flat River, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14422) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Ste. Genevieve, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 14423) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Carthage, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 14424) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating beverages on the islands of American Samoa and Guam; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 14425) prohibiting threats by mail against the President of the United States or against any officer who may by the law of succession be entitled to succeed to the office of President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14426) to amend section 6 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross," approved January 5, 1905; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 14427) granting additional leave of absence, with pay, to employees within the Federal classified service attending militia maneuvers or Federal instruction camps; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 14428) to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 14429) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at East Moline, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 14430) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct a foot-passenger bridge over Mattawoman Creek, Charles County, Md., for the use of the employees of the Government proving grounds at Indianhead; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: A resolution (H. Res. 198) making it in order for the Speaker to entertain motions for the consideration of bills of a privileged character on the first and third Mondays of each month; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARNHART: A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 28) providing for the printing of the prayers of the Chaplain of the House during the Sixty-third Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York favoring an increased Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAKES: A bill (H. R. 14431) for the relief of John Henry Gibbons, captain on the retired list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 14432) granting an increase of pension to Robert Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 14433) granting an increase of pension to Squire Grose; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 14434) granting a pension to Isabella C. Waddell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14435) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Thacker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 14436) for the relief of Morris Dietrich; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 14437) granting a pension to Mrs. Jennie B. Darby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14438) granting a pension to Charlotte M. Beckham, widow of Capt. R. H. Beckham, deceased; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 14439) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Bass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14440) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Steinmetz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14441) for the relief of Lyman Bryant; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 14442) granting an increase of pension to William W. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 14443) granting a pension to Frederick W. Mellor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 14444) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 14445) for the relief of George F. De Maranville; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCRACKEN: A bill (H. R. 14446) granting a pension to John L. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 14447) for the relief of Owen Matthews; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14448) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Smolinski; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14449) granting a pension to Abram Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 14450) granting an increase of pension to Alfred A. Bonney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 14451) granting an increase of pension to William Roush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 14452) granting a pension to George W. Burk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14453) granting an increase of pension to John H. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 14454) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 14455) granting a pension to Joseph P. Weis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14456) for the relief of John J. Dooley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 14457) granting an increase of pension to Stephen J. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14458) granting an increase of pension to James H. Tunnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 14459) granting an increase of pension to William M. Mackey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14460) to correct the military record of Edward S. Knappen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 14461) granting a pension to Ella Mitchell York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 14462) for the relief of George Deitz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14463) for the relief of Albert E. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 14464) granting a pension to James E. Whitehead; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14465) granting a pension to Rosa E. Lilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 14466) granting a pension to Carrie A. Stittions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 14467) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Reel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 14468) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Finney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Society of Sponsors of the United States Navy, pledging loyalty to the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of women voters of Washington, favoring action on the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Health Officers' Association of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring Federal aid for indigent persons afflicted with tuberculosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Memorial of Board of Trade of the city of Newark, N. J., relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of W. R. Davidson, George F. Guyer, Ben Butterworth, Rev. Nelson B. Kline, C. C. Ball, John Sterrat, jr., J. J. Mitchell, Fred Kleine, Charles B. Graffius, A. E. Fox, George Proud, Clair Caldwell, R. J. Protzeller, D. B. Beaver, F. N. Artley, Sidney Alsop, J. C. Wesner, Harry M. Finn, Alex Leslie, Samuel Jessop, Thomas Bell, Guy Leslie, James Bendle, Logan Long, Albert Marsh, John Bendle, jr., C. M. Darling, J. H. Leslie, and J. H. Temple, all of Spangler, Pa., in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of 104 citizens of Bethel and Upper St. Clair Townships, Allegheny County, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, the First Christian Church, the United Presbyterian Church, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Homestead; the New Century Club and First Presbyterian Church of Dormont; the United Presbyterian Church and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Crafton; the United Presbyterian Church and Baptist Church of Mount Lebanon; the Civic Club of Bridgeville; the Beechview Methodist Church and Lutheran Church of the Redeemer of Pittsburgh; Forest Grove Presbyterian Church, of McKees Rocks; and Bethel Presbyterian Church, of Bridgeville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 95 citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., favoring House bill 6468, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the faculty of the department of architecture of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, against the erection of the proposed power house on the Potomac Channel, near the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of 117 voters of Duquesne, Pa., favoring the passage of House joint resolutions 84 and 85, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for nationwide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of John H. Martens, favoring passage of Stevens-Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Light & Power Co., St. Louis, Mo., against passage of bills relative to numbers on motor boats; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Typotheta of New York City, favoring House bill 11621, relative to mailing catalogues, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of National Association of Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, New York City, favoring House bill 5792, relative to salaries in Bureau of Animal Industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. A. McCarthy, New York City, favoring House bill 6915, the Griffin bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE: Memorial of Cigarmakers' Union No. 381, of Watertown, Wis., favoring passage of House bill 6871, relative to convict-made goods; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CASEY: Memorial of Pittston City District of the Luzerne County Sabbath School Association, State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of Republican State Central Committee of Wyoming, favoring woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Pineoleum Co., of New York City, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Western Oil Jobbers' Association, favoring effectual dissolution of the Standard Oil Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. E. Shrewsbury, of New York City, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of First Baptist Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Cambridge, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of sundry citizens of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., against the Sunday-observance bill in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of Union League Club, of Chicago, and Society of Colonial Wars, in the District of Columbia, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Western Oil Jobbers' Association, relative to effectual dissolution of the Standard Oil Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of United States penitentiary guards at Leavenworth, Kans., for increase in pay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Ottie W. Smith and other citizens of Alameda County, Cal., against passage of House bill 652, Sunday-observance bill in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Ottie W. Smith and others, of Alameda County, Cal., against passage of bills to amend the postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Berkeley, Cal., favoring the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the board of supervisors of Alameda County, Cal., favoring House bill 8352, to standardize the treatment of tuberculosis and provide Federal aid to indigent patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Trinity Church, of Berkeley, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Berkeley (Cal.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of Western Oil Jobbers' Association, favoring effectual dissolution of the Standard Oil Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Olin J. Stephens, of New York, relative to compulsory military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Pineoleum Co., of New York City, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of committee on provision for the feeble-minded, favoring House bill 13666, relative to feeble-minded in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Richey, Browne & Donald, of New York City, against passage of bill to regulate method of directing the work of Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Culver (Ind.) Military School, relative to amendments to the military bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: Memorial of Southwestern Millers' League, favoring a merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of El Paso (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Civic League of Del Rio, Tex., favoring inspection of dairy products; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of Richey Browne & Donald, of New York City, against passage of a bill to regulate the method of directing the work of Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Ohio Association Volunteer Retired List, relative to Volunteer officers' retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Pineoleum Co., of New York City, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Petition of citizens of Old Town, Me., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 12449, to pension John G. Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of Ministerial Association of Medford, Presbyterian Church of Creswell, Woman's Civic Improvement Club of Creswell, sundry citizens of Oregon, and citizens of Linn, Oreg., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Petition of Mrs. J. E. Laurence and 7 other citizens of Phoenix, Ariz., opposing the passage of House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Tula A. Robertson and 34 other citizens of Flagstaff, Ariz., favoring the adoption of a prohibition amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Rev. J. B. Buckey and 47 others, of Salineville, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of American Flint Glass Works Local Union, Toronto, Ohio, against repeal of the seamen's act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of 28 citizens of Seattle, and Perseverance Lodge, No. 121, International Order of Good Templars, of Seattle, Wash., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of a number of citizens of Cumberland, Md., opposing the passage of House bill 8348; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Akeley, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Gerrit Masselink and 18 others, of Big Rapids, Mecosta County, Mich., favoring passage of woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Petition of Pioneer Methodist Church of St. Johns, Portland, Oreg., favoring the establishment of a Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Central Presbyterian Church, of Portland, Oreg., favoring the establishment of a Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of First United Brethren Church, of Portland, Oreg., favoring establishment of a Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Petition of citizens and organizations of the State of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of citizens of Lamont, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Crawford County, Wis., against bills to amend the postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and organizations of Wisconsin, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORTH: Petition of the Holy Name Society of St. Patrick's Church, for the Federal-censorship bill for moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Federation of Catholic Societies, for the Federal-censorship bill for moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Homer City Council, No. 199, Junior Order United American Mechanics, against the Fitzgerald postal bill and the Siegel postal bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 57 citizens of Indiana County, Pa., favoring a Christian amendment to Constitution of United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of Brotherhood Class of Cliftondale, Sangus, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Massachusetts favoring embargo on arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of the widows of soldiers of the United States, who reside in the city of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Ashbrook widows' pension bill, House bill 11707; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of Mrs. Ellen L. Rupert and others of Rockport, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Joe Senger and 79 other residents of Franklin Grove, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Board of Supervisors of Alameda County, Cal., favoring House bill 8325; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Health Officers' Association of Los Angeles County, Cal., favoring Federal aid for indigent persons afflicted with tuberculosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of International Christian Endeavor of Congregational Church at Crete, Nebr., favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany House bill 14415 for relief of O. W. Lindsley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: Petition of A. E. Peck Manufacturing Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., against continuance of tax on tooth paste; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Calhoun Commercial Club of Minneapolis, Minn., relative to national control of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEAGALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Downs, Ala., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Samson, Ala., relative to rural-credits legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Alabama, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of Women's Conference of Jewish Organizations, Los Angeles, and Cremieux Lodge, San Francisco; also communications from Edward F. Mullen and 21 others of Los Angeles, all in the State of California, protesting against the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, Cal., favoring peaceful settlement of international disputes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Building Material Dealers Creditors' Association, Sebastian Kraemer, E. H. Porter, and F. W. Enderly, all of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Women's Club, of Lodi, Cal., and the California Federation of Women's Clubs, San Francisco, Cal., favoring appropriations for Yosemite National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of Board of Supervisors, Alameda, and Health Officers' Association of Los Angeles, both in the State of California, favoring Federal aid for indigent consumptives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mary R. Moore and 33 others of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the Warren bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Jefferson Davis Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the Works bill for the relief of Confederate veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of California Associated Societies for the Conservation of Wild Life, favoring a national-park service; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Palisade, Colo., against passage of compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of J. A. Forsythe and 15 other citizens of Beaver and Lawrence Counties, favoring a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of F. H. Evarts and 43 others, of New Haven, Conn., favoring bills to amend the postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of United States Penitentiary guards at Leavenworth, Kans., for increase of pay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Society of the Chagres, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, relative to resolution to reward members of the Isthmian Canal Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WASON: Petitions of John A. Scott and 10 other residents of Bennington, Miss F. L. Edwards and 21 other residents of Bennington, N. H., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Bennington Grange, of Bennington, N. H., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 11, 1916.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy name has been the hope and inspiration of our Nation in all its history. In the time of our conscious weakness our fathers called upon Thy name. Thou didst deliver us. Thou didst give us power. In the day of our conscious strength and greatness we call upon Thy name that we forget not Thy benefits to us and that we may remember Thou hast a purpose in all that Thou hast ministered unto us as a Nation. Thou hast sent us upon a mission among the nations of the earth. Thy kingdom is within us. We pray that our Nation may be in our hearts as well and that Thy kingdom and our Nation may be one in our hearts. With a divine inspiration and with a godly purpose may we address ourselves to the tasks of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.